Class 283.0 48Q Book P736
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK
PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

BY THE

REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
COMMENTARY ON

ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL

(IN "THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY").

Fourth Edition, in post 8vo, price 12*s.*

"We feel heartily that the book will bring credit to English scholarship, and that in its carefulness, its sobriety of tone, its thoughtfulness, its reverence, it will contribute to a stronger faith in the essential trustworthiness of the Gospel record."
GUARDIAN.

"A notable production, and will prove invaluable to the clergyman." *ATHENÆUM.*

"This seems to be the edition of St. Luke we have waited for so long. It will take its place without disparagement beside Dr. Driver's 'Deuteronomy' and Dr. Sanday's 'Romans.' These works have made the name of the 'Critical Commentary' a household word, not in our country only, even on the Continent also. Where they have gone Dr. Plummer will follow, and we dare predict as favourable a reception."
EXPOSITORY TIMES.

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

From the Death of Archbishop Parker to the Death of King Charles I.

FOUR LECTURES

BY THE

REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D.

FORMERLY FELLOW AND TUTOR OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD AND MASTER OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, DURHAM

Magnum nunc secula nostra
Venturi discrimen habent.

LUCAN, *Phars.* iv. 191.

SECOND EDITION

EDINBURGH
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET
1914

283.048Q
P736

63349

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

THIS BOOK MAY BE KEPT
YEARS

PREFACE.

Two things need to be stated respecting these four lectures: (1) they were not written with a view to publication; (2) they were not written with the expectation of supplying anything that was very original.

(1) The lectures were written to excite the interest, or refresh the memories, of those who asked for them and came to listen to them; in the hope that some might thereby be induced to begin, or return to, independent study of the momentous period in which the lectures attempt to point out some leading features. They were not produced with the anticipation of making a permanent addition to the abundant literature on the subject; and when the project of publishing them was first urged upon the lecturer by some of those who heard him, he put aside the proposal on the ground that the lectures were probably of too ephemeral a character to merit preservation after they had served their immediate purpose. But when the request for publication became frequent, and when he was assured by those whose judgment weighed

much with him, that the lectures, if printed, would be of real use, both to those who heard them and to many more who had not done so, he was shaken in this opinion. And when the clergy who attended the Summer School of Theology at Durham in July 1904 made a formal request for the publication of these four studies in English Church History, he was induced to go so far as to consult his old friends, Messrs. T. & T. Clark of Edinburgh, as to what might be done with prudence. Their reply was so encouraging that he began to prepare the lectures for publication. In doing so he has thought it best to leave them almost unaltered. Their form shows that they were meant for *vivâ voce* delivery and were not composed as historical disquisitions. Hence the frequent use of *italics*, indicating what was underlined for emphasis in reading aloud. An attempt to abolish this form would rob them of their primitive character, without increasing their value; they would cease to be lectures, but would not become anything better. The real difference between the lectures as published and as delivered, is that a certain number of paragraphs, which had to be abbreviated or omitted in delivery, in order to keep within the limits of an hour, are now given in full, and that the notes have been increased.

(2) The writer does not suppose that he has much that is original to offer. It is true that, in preparing this volume, original and contemporaneous sources have to a considerable extent been used;

and it is possible that some of the points urged have not been urged before, or at least not in the same manner. But, in the main, these lectures are based upon, and in some particulars are directly derived from, modern works which are accessible to every one. A list of these is given below, and the writer's debt to some of them is large. He believes that it is largest in the case of two historians whom he had the happiness of knowing—Bishop Creighton and Leopold von Ranke. He took part with the former and four others in translating the *History of England* of the latter into English. Mr. W. H. Hutton's book was also very useful for the reign of Charles I. What should have been an earlier volume in the same series (Mr. W. H. Frere on Elizabeth and James I.) has been delayed in publication, and the lecturer had no opportunity of consulting it.

In treating of a period about which Englishmen feel so strongly as the great religious and political struggles of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it is perhaps impossible to be wholly impartial. But it *is* possible to *try* to be fair; and the attempt has been made in these lectures. We should have much less disputing, and our controversies would be much more fruitful, if each side would resolutely endeavour to see the matter in dispute from the point of view of the other side, before giving utterance to severe criticisms and sweeping condemnations.

And there is another peril with regard to this period from which it is difficult wholly to escape.

It may easily be thought by some readers that the amount of *secular* history that is touched upon in lectures which profess to deal with English *Church* History is rather large. But, throughout this whole period, ecclesiastical and political causes and effects are inextricably intertwined, and it is impossible to make either the religious or the secular side of the history intelligible, without saying a great deal about the other. Nevertheless, it is only too possible that in this case the right proportion between the two has not always been maintained. The difficulty of knowing precisely what to omit, when so much had of necessity to be omitted, has throughout been very considerable.

The trouble of preparing this little volume for publication will be amply repaid, if it induces a few more people to become acquainted with some of the books which were used in producing it; and perhaps with some of the far larger number which ought to have been employed, but which, owing to the writer's want of knowledge or of opportunity, were left unused. Some idea of the size of the latter class may be obtained by a glance at the cruelly copious Bibliography in the first two volumes of the *Cambridge Modern History*.

The following are the principal modern works that have been used:—

Anon., *The Life and Correspondence of Lord Bacon.*
Arber, E., *An English Garner*, vol. viii.
Burnet, G., *History of his own Time*, vol. i.
Burrows, Montagu, *Commentaries on the History of England.*

Cambridge Modern History, vols. i. and ii.
CARLYLE, T., *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches.*
CAZENOVE, J. G., *Some Aspects of the Reformation.*
CHURCH, R. W., *Bacon.*
Spenser.
Church Quarterly Review.
COLLINS, W. E., *The Northern Rebellion. Queen Elizabeth's Defence.*
CREIGHTON, M., *The Age of Elizabeth* (Epochs of Mod. Hist.).
Queen Elizabeth.
Historical Lectures and Addresses.
Dictionary of National Biography.
DÖLLINGER, I., *Kleinere Schriften.*
Historical and Literary Addresses.
DÖLLINGER und REUSCH, *Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten in der römisch-katholischen Kirche.*
Encyclopedia Britannica.
FEARENSIDE, C. S., *History of England from* 1485 *to* 1603.
FREEMAN, E. A., *Growth of the English Constitution.*
FROUDE, J. A., *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada*, vols. ix. to xii.
GARDINER, S. R., *History of England from the Accession of James I.*
The Puritan Revolution (Epochs of Mod. Hist.).
GARDINER and BULLINGER, *Introduction to the Study of English History.*
GEE and HARDY, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History.*
GREEN, J. R., *History of English People.*
GRIESINGER, T., *The Jesuits.*
HALLAM, H., *Constitutional History of England*, vols. i. and ii.
Introduction to the Literature of Europe.
HÄUSSER, L., *The Period of the Reformation.*
HOOK, W. F., *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.*
HUTTON, W. H., *The English Church from the Accession of Charles I. to the Death of Queen Anne.*

LINGARD, J., *History of England*, vols. vi. to viii.
MACAULAY, T., *History of England*, vol. i.
Essays.
MACOWER, F., *Constitutional History of the Church of England.*
MARSDEN, J. B., *History of the Early Puritans.*
MORLEY, J., *Oliver Cromwell.*
MOSHEIM, J. L., *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. iii.
MOZLEY, J. B., *Essays on Strafford, Laud, and Cromwell.*
OXENHAM, H. N., *Studies in Ecclesiastical History and Biography.*
PATTISON, MARK, *Isaac Casaubon.*
PERRY, G. G., *History of the Reformation in England* (Epochs of Church History).
RANKE, L., *History of England*, vols. i. and ii.
REUSCH, F. H., *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Jesuitenordens.*
SEEBOHM, F., *The Era of the Protestant Revolution* (Epochs of Mod. Hist.).
SHAW, W. A., *History of the English Church during the Civil Wars.*
SMITH, GOLDWIN, *Three English Statesmen.*
TASWELL-LANGMEAD, T. P., *English Constitutional History.*
WHITE, F. O., *Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops.*

The lectures were originally asked for by the Exeter Diocesan Church Reading Society, and have been delivered at several centres in Devonshire during the spring and autumn of 1904, as well as at Durham in the summer. The second, third, and fourth were also delivered, at the request of the Central Society of Sacred Study, at Bristol.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

PREFACE v

I. COUNTER-REFORMATION AND ULTRA-REFORMATION 1

II. THE WISE FOOL IN CHURCH AND STATE . . 41

III. DEVELOPMENT OF DESPOTISM IN CHURCH AND STATE 83

IV. DOWNFALL OF EPISCOPACY AND MONARCHY . 123

APPENDIX 165

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE 171

INDEX 175

I.

1575–1603.

COUNTER-REFORMATION AND ULTRA-REFORMATION.

"Men must beware, that in the procuring or muniting of religious unity, they do not dissolve and deface the laws of charity and of human society. There be two swords among Christians, the spiritual and temporal; and both have their due office and place in the maintenance of religion. But we may not take up the third sword, which is Mahomet's sword, or like unto it; that is to propagate religion by wars or by sanguinary persecutions to force consciences; except it be in cases of overt scandal, blasphemy, or intermixture of practice against the state. . . . It was great blasphemy when the devil said, *I will ascend and be like the Highest*; but it is greater blasphemy to personate God, and bring Him in saying, *I will descend and be like the prince of darkness*: and what is it better, to make the cause of religion to descend to the cruel and execrable actions of murdering princes, butchery of people, and subversion of states and governments?"

BACON, *Essays; Of Unity in Religion.*

I.

1575–1603.

COUNTER-REFORMATION AND ULTRA-REFORMATION.

The English Reformation must have come, whatever sovereigns had ruled in England and whatever their personal desires might have been. *Must* have come, because—

1. For a very long time the nation had felt that *Roman claims* were incompatible with English interests and English rights.

2. Much of *Roman doctrine* was found to be detrimental to character and out of harmony with Scripture and primitive teaching.

3. The low standard of life which prevailed in the *monasteries* had long been a scandal. That so much wealth should be so abused shocked both reason and conscience.

4. The *Revival of Letters* in some ways told against religion generally: it told with disintegrating force against all religious teaching and practice which had its strength in ignorance rather than in enlightenment. Other reasons might be suggested,

arising out of social and economical conditions; but these four are sufficient to justify the belief that in 1509 the English Reformation was inevitable.

When Archbishop Parker died in 1575,[1] the main points in the Reformation of the English Church had been secured.

1. The *authority of the See of Rome* over the Church of England had been finally cast off.

2. The *clergy* were allowed to *marry*.

3. *Auricular confession* ceased to be compulsory.

4. A *simple Prayer Book in the English language* had taken the place of the complicated Latin service-books.

5. By means of the Prayer Book, the Articles, and the Homilies, considerable changes had been made in *doctrine*. All that was contrary to Scripture had been discarded, together with a great deal which was certainly not essential, was open to question, and had in some cases produced grave abuse; but all that was Scriptural and much that was primitive had been retained.

The experience of the coming years was to show whether this necessary (and on the whole) *moderate Reformation could be maintained in the face of the persistent assaults of Romanism and Puritanism*; and, supposing that it were maintained, whether the details which still required settlement would be settled in the direction of Catholicism or of Calvinism.

[1] Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, and Bullinger, the Zurich reformer, died in the same year, 1575; Pilkington of Durham, 3rd January 1576. Jewel of Salisbury had died in 1571.

It was not to be expected that either the Pope, with his intractable ally, Philip of Spain, or the Puritans, with their supporters on the Continent, would allow Elizabeth and the English Church to determine these questions for themselves. Rome had by no means abandoned all hope of winning back the English nation to her allegiance; and the Puritans, both inside and outside the Church of England, were agreed that a clean sweep must be made of nearly everything that had been retained, before a satisfactory Reformation could be reached. It is *the contest between these two forces*, which we may call *Counter-Reformation* and *Ultra-Reformation*, and the way in which Elizabeth defeated the attacks of both of them, that we now have to consider; and we must endeavour to concentrate our attention upon them, while we pass by much that is attractive and important. But it is impossible to understand either movement, without taking account of one who is the most romantic and fascinating personage in the reign of Elizabeth, *Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots.*

The Counter-Reformation may be looked at from two different points of view.—On the one hand, it was an attempt to satisfy the conscience of Christendom by reforming some of the crying abuses which had led to the Protestant revolt: such reforms might at any rate prevent the revolt from going further. On the other hand, it was an attempt to win back again to the Papacy those princes and peoples

which had thrown off the jurisdiction of Rome. The one was, in the main, a *conciliatory* effort, and to describe its successes and failures would be to write the history of the Council of Trent. The other was wholly an *aggressive* effort; and it is with this aggressive side of the Counter-Reformation that we have to do.

The Counter-Reformation, in its persistent and ferocious assault upon Christian liberty in general, and upon Protestantism in particular, had *two great instruments*—the *Inquisition*, which had been in existence since the thirteenth century, and the *Company of the Jesuits*, which was instituted in a very humble way in 1540, but became very flourishing about the time of the excommunication of Elizabeth by Pius v. in 1570. To these two should perhaps be added a third, the *Index of Prohibited Books*. These are the three "bad angels" which the Church of Rome sent out to fight its battle against Christian freedom in thought and speech and action. We may ignore the Inquisition and the Index, which have had little influence in England; but we must take account of the Jesuits.

The *Company of the Jesuits* has been described as "a naked sword, whose hilt is at Rome, and whose point is everywhere." The sword is rightly called "naked." It is never sheathed, and has never ceased to fight. It has won some notable victories. But a strange fatality attends its triumphs. *They are Cadmean victories, equivalent to defeats.* The Jesuits have won immense influence in various

governments all over the world. And their success has led to political catastrophes, which have recoiled upon the schemers, whose policy prepared the way for them. This has been the case in *Spain*, now reduced to a fifth-rate power, after having been almost supreme in Europe; in *England*, where Roman Catholics are specially excluded from succession to the throne; and in the *States of the Church*, which have been lost to the Papacy, probably for ever. In education and in society the result has been the same. In *France*, in the middle of the seventeenth century, the Jesuits were the chief trainers of the educated classes, and were also the confessors of the king. And, long before the century was over, France was in the hands of Deistical and Atheistical revolutionists, from whose influence she has never recovered. If one were asked to single out the main cause of the appalling irreligion which now desolates French society, one could hardly come nearer to the truth than by naming Jesuit influence on the court of Louis XIV. In missionary work we see the same result: abundance of converts, but no Christian Church established. Where are the once flourishing Jesuit missions in Japan, in China, in Paraguay? And the wrecks of Jesuit missions, where they do survive, as in India, have not helped the other Christian missions which have followed them.

But the most signal instance of this strange characteristic, of winning successes which are sure forerunners of disaster, is found in the estimate of

themselves which they have everywhere produced. They have been able to guide kings and statesmen, to instruct the young, to build and fill churches, to make recruits; but they have not been able to win confidence and affection. They have invariably provoked mistrust and dislike, pretty nearly in proportion to their success. Unknown societies are often distrusted and disliked, because people are ignorant of their character and aims. As these become known, suspicion and opposition die out. But, in the case of this strange Society, it is where people have had most experience of its character, aims, and methods, that the distrust and the dislike are most profound; and this is quite as true of Roman Catholic countries as of Protestant states. The Jesuits have often inspired wonder and admiration; but they have seldom won trust or love.

The Jesuits aimed at getting control of Europe by supplying it with schools, with preachers, with confessors, with diplomatists, with men of public influence. Their agents worked with zeal and cleverness, and with very large measure of success. But, in the long run, literature and art, government and politics, religion and morality, have all been depraved by their activity. By preferring effect to reality they have misled the taste, and by preferring subtleties to plain principles they have confused the consciences, of all those whom they have influenced. Jesuit style in architecture and literature means showiness and insipidity, just as Jesuit casuistry in

morals and diplomacy means systematic perversion of the first principles of right and honour.[1]

The Society of the Jesuits was founded to defeat Protestantism.—While Protestantism sacrificed everything to the individual conscience, the Jesuits treated the individual conscience with contempt. Every Jesuit surrendered himself "like a corpse" to his superior. Instead of his own will, or judgment, or conscience, he accepted, without question, the commands of another. He was to combat the extravagance of individual religion by the extravagance of self-effacement. And yet, absolutely opposed as the Jesuits were to the Puritans both in general principles and in details of doctrine and worship, there was this fundamental resemblance between the two. Both were prepared to sacrifice the rights and interests of society to their own view of religious truth. By neither of them were the tastes, customs, relationships, or affections of other men thought worthy of any consideration, when they stood in the way of their own special aims. Each was ready to ride roughshod over the minds and hearts of men to the goal which had been chosen. In this respect Ignatius Loyola was neither more nor less relentless than John Calvin or John Knox.

[1] "What is wholly incompatible with the nature of the Jesuit system is an element of independence. . . . Independence of character, of mind, of research, are objects hateful to the Society, and in lieu of these it has evolved a system of pseudo-culture, studded with the counterfeits of science—playthings adapted to natures that are being carefully nursed to grow up with stunted strength" (Cartwright, *The Jesuits: their Constitution and Teaching*, p. 226).

We must look back a little in order to see the precise point at which this stream of influence begins to make itself felt in England under Elizabeth.[1]

In 1569 there had been a *rising in the North of England*, in which the Percies, Cliffords, and Nevilles took up arms against the Queen. This was a *religious* movement *within the kingdom.* It *aimed at restoring the old religion.* It did not aim at deposing Elizabeth, but only at getting her to recognize the Roman Catholic Mary of Scots as her successor. It was easily put down, after a momentary revival of the Mass in Durham Cathedral; but how many people secretly sympathized with it? No one knew then, or knows now.[2] In the masterly address which Elizabeth forthwith issued to her subjects, she answered by anticipation the Bull *Regnans in excelsis*, in which Pius v. excommunicated Elizabeth and *released her subjects from their allegiance to her*; the Bull says, "We likewise forbid her barons and peoples henceforth to obey this woman's commands and laws, under pain of excommunication." Consequently English Romanists had forthwith to choose between the Queen and the Pope. It was now impossible to be loyal to both. It is not necessary

[1] The influence is plainly alluded to in Spenser's *Faery Queene* (I. ii.), when Archimago (Hypocrisy or Jesuit wiles) with Duessa (the Church of Rome or Mary of Scots) gets the better of the Red Cross knight for a time.

[2] Contemporary ballads seem to show that in the South there was not much sympathy. In modern poetry the sufferings of those who took part in this hapless rebellion are commemorated in Wordsworth's *White Doe of Rylstone.*

for Englishmen to insist upon the folly of this step: that has been done for us already by a later Pope. *Urban VIII.* said, "We know that we may declare Protestants excommunicate, as Pius V. declared Queen Elizabeth, and before him Clement VII. the king of England, Henry VIII. But with what success? The whole world can tell; we yet bewail it in tears of blood."

Then came Cecil's discovery of the *Ridolfi Plot*, which ended in the Duke of Norfolk being sent to the scaffold, 2nd June 1572. While the Northern rebellion was an attempt by means of internal forces to bring about a return to Romanism, the Ridolfi Plot was an attempt to employ *the external forces of Rome* (in Spain and the Netherlands) to restore Romanism in England. Both failed.

Less than three months later, Englishmen were stricken with horror and indignation at the *Massacre of St. Bartholomew.* Elizabeth could not afford to break the alliance recently made with France; but she gratified national feeling by a dramatic rebuke to the representative of the guilty government. The French ambassador had asked for an interview. She received him at Woodstock, with her Council around her, all in deep mourning. The ambassador entered in dead silence, and his excuses met with no response. Elizabeth said that she could not send an embassy to a country in which life was not safe. Burghley added that the massacre was the most horrible crime that had been committed since the Crucifixion.

That devout but sanguinary bigot, *Pius v., had died the previous May*; and *perhaps* he knew nothing of the preparations for the massacre.[1] But his successor, *Gregory XIII.*, went in procession to the Church of St. Louis in Rome to return thanks to God for it; and he sent a nuncio to France to congratulate the King.

In 1583, Wm. Cecil wrote from Paris to his grandfather, Lord Burghley, "On St. Bartholomew's Day we had here solemn Processions and other tokens of triumph and joy, in remembrance of the slaughter committed this time eleven years past. But I doubt they will not so triumph at the Day of Judgment."

Gregory XIII. has immortalized himself by the reform of the Calendar: for this, all Europe owes him thanks. It owes him less gratitude for *his ceaseless efforts to suppress Protestantism* and *his enthusiastic support of the Jesuits*, for whom, with wrong-headed munificence, he founded no less than two-and-twenty colleges. The *English College at Douai* was founded in 1568 by Dr. Wm. Allen, formerly Principal of St. Mary Hall, Oxford. A

[1] Dean Church says of Pius v.: "Devout and self-denying as a saint, fierce and inflexible against abuses as a puritan, resolute and uncompromising as a Jacobin idealist or an Asiatic despot, ruthless and inexorable as an executioner, his soul was bent on re-establishing, not only by preaching and martyrdom, but by the sword and by the stake, the unity of Christendom and of its belief. He broke through the temporizing caution of his predecessors by the Bull of Deposition against Elizabeth in 1570. And though dead, his spirit was paramount in th slaughter of St. Bartholomew in 1572" (*Spenser*, p. 10).

little later, another college was founded at Rome by Gregory, "to *sow* the *seeds* of the Romish religion in England. Whereupon they were called *Seminaries*," as Camden says. From 1576 onwards, seminary priests, trained on the Continent, began to pour into England, and in 1579 Allen went to Rome to consult Gregory as to the best means of winning back England to the Holy See. *In June 1580 the Jesuit leaders, Parsons and Campian, landed at Dover.*[1] Loyola, who had been dead for twenty-five years, had admitted one Englishman to the Society, and perhaps twenty more had been admitted since his death; but hitherto nearly all of them had worked abroad. Parsons and Campian were men of mark, each representing a different element in Roman methods of activity. Parsons, who landed first, was a consummate schemer, Campian a simple-minded devotee. Campian's winning manners and persuasive eloquence proved

[1] A writer in the *Edinburgh Review* of April 1891 has stated that, previous to 1580, "no Jesuit had ever been seen in England." This is not quite correct. Loyola had sent Pasquier Brouet and another to England in 1541. But they knew no English and were therefore helpless, and they soon left. Jasper Heywood, ex-Fellow of All Souls', returned to England after becoming a Jesuit, but he seems to have accomplished very little. Like Heywood, Parsons (Balliol) and Campian (St. John's) were Oxford graduates, and Parsons had been Fellow and Chaplain. When Elizabeth visited Oxford in 1566, Campian took part in the disputations in Natural Philosophy, Wednesday, 4th September, and his speech is still preserved. Although not the first Jesuits to visit England, Parsons and Campian were the first to produce much effect, and it was largely owing to them that Romanism in England did not quietly die out. See *Mosheim*, iii. 48, 49.

very attractive: he was listened to by multitudes; and the police always arrived too late. Several of the nobility were won over, and there was general alarm.

Hitherto Romanists had frequently attended the reformed services, hoping in time to get something more to their mind; and it was this lax conformity of his co-religionists which had moved Allen to found the college at Douai. The seminarists did their best to stop this, and to discourage all intimacy with Protestants. The government was surprised to find how rapidly "recusants"—that is, persons who refused to attend public worship—were increasing. *Polemical literature of a virulent kind* was issued from secret printing-presses: in it, Elizabeth was denounced as illegitimate and a usurper; "with 16,000 men she could be overthrown, for two-thirds of the nation were still Roman at heart." Here is a specimen taken from the Appeal of the Jesuit Sanders to the Catholic Lords and Gentlemen of Ireland, 20th February 1580:—

"What mean you, I say, to be at so great charges, to take so great pains, and to put yourselves in so horrible danger of body and soul for a wicked Woman, neither begotten in true wedlock nor esteeming her christendom, and therefore deprived by the Vicar of Christ, her and your lawful judge? . . . See you not that she is such a shameful reproach to the royal Crown, that whoso is indeed a friend to the Crown should so much the

more hasten to dispossess her of the same?" It may be mentioned in passing that *the Jesuit attack on Ireland failed* utterly, and that *the attack on Scotland failed* also; we must confine our attention to what took place in England.

The Jesuits and other Roman incendiaries did not stop at preaching rebellion. Writings were disseminated calling on the faithful to imitate the example of Judith against this female Holofernes.[1] *The assassination of the Queen* was so persistently suggested, that at last *John Somerville*, a young enthusiast from Warwickshire, went to London in October 1583 to kill Elizabeth. He betrayed himself, and was sent to the Tower. Next month *Francis Throgmorton* was executed for scheming to bring over the Duke of Guise with an army, put Elizabeth to death, and set Mary Stuart on the throne.

Elizabeth's foes were implacable, and their resources seemed to be inexhaustible. True that all their attempts had failed; that the nation was becoming gradually more united, and the Queen

[1] That the attempts to murder Elizabeth had high ecclesiastical sanction has been shown by Reusch (*Beiträge zur Gesch. des Jesuitenordens*, pp. 254–263) from *The Letters and Memorials of William Cardinal Allen* (1582–1594), edited by the Fathers of the London Oratory; with an historical introduction by Th. Fr. Knox, Priest of the same Congregation. London, 1882. See also Döllinger und Reusch, *Die Selbsbiographie des Cardinal Bellarmin*, pp. 306, 307. In the *Beiträge* is abundant evidence as to Jesuit teaching respecting the killing of tyrants and heretics. *A very true Report of the apprehension and taking of that arch-Papist Campion* (1581) is reprinted in Arber's *English Garner*, viii.

becoming more firmly fixed in its affections, and therefore on the throne. Nevertheless, the unflagging persistency of her foes was depressing to her Council, if not to herself; and the year 1584 opened in much gloom. July 10th, *William the Silent*, whose life had already been attempted six times, *was assassinated*, and *the United Provinces*, in their revolt against the Roman Catholic tyranny of Spain, *were left without a leader*. If the Prince of Parma succeeded in putting down the revolt, his army of Spanish veterans would be free to invade England. And if William of Orange, after six escapes, had at last fallen a victim to the assassin, what chance had Elizabeth of ultimate escape? Her behaviour at this crisis was really noble. Perhaps she felt no fear: she certainly behaved with absolute fearlessness. She was as easy of access as ever, and absolutely refused to retire from publicity. She said that she was not going to be a prisoner in her own kingdom. She would live among her people and trust them to guard her person. And her courage saved her at least once. We know of one assassin, Parry, who confessed that his heart failed him when he came into her presence and saw her intrepid behaviour.

But statesmen were obliged to treat the matter differently; and we must now look at the measures which were taken to defeat and put down these attempts at rebellion, foreign invasion and assassination, all of them undertaken in the name of religion and in the interests of the Roman See.

In the spring of 1581, *Elizabeth's Fourth Parliament re-enacted many of the provisions against reconciliation with Rome* made in 1563, by which it was made high treason to make converts, or aid or conceal those who did so. (1) A fine of 100 marks and a year's imprisonment for hearing Mass, and a fine of 200 marks and a year's imprisonment for saying Mass. (2) A fine of £20 a month for adults who were absent from Church services. (3) A year's imprisonment for teaching without a licence from the Ordinary, and a fine of £10 for employing unlicensed teachers.

It is saddening to contrast such legislation as this with the policy sketched out by Elizabeth in her grand address to the nation after the Northern rebellion of 1569. Then she had said, "We have no meaning to allow that our subjects be molested either by examination or inquisition *in any matter of faith*, so long as they profess the Christian faith, not gainsaying the authority of Holy Scripture and of the articles of our faith contained in the Creeds, Apostolic and Catholic; or *in any matter of ceremonies*, so long as they shall, in their outward conversation, show themselves quiet and conformable, and not manifestly repugnant to laws of our realm, established for frequentation of Divine service in the ordinary Churches." But the Pope was to blame for mixing up his spiritual claims with temporal claims and trying to secure submission by conspiracy and violence. His invasion of England by secret agents inciting to rebellion and murder

led inevitably to stern measures of repression. *It was impossible to treat such a movement as purely religious*, and allow it to claim toleration on the plea of liberty of conscience. *The Pope had made it impossible for a Protestant government to grant liberty of preaching to Roman Catholics.*[1] He did not content himself with claiming that Romanists should have equal rights with Protestants: he demanded that all who refused his religion and rule should be handed over to destruction. The future of England was at stake; for the success of the Roman propaganda meant the rule of Mary Stuart under the selfish control of the Pope, instead of the rule of Elizabeth, resting on the goodwill of her subjects and directed towards the well-being of the nation. It was the whole difference between mental and political servitude and mental and political freedom. The Roman missionaries were imprisoned and executed, not because they taught a creed believed to be false, but *because they made men traitors to the State.*[2] It is easier to condemn the persecuting legislation than to suggest an alternative that would have been effectual.

And *it is not fair to treat the persecution of*

[1] See the speech of Sir Walter Mildmay, January 1581 (Hansard, *P.H.*, i. pp. 813 ff.), and Paton's comments (*British History and Papal Claims*, i. pp. 102 ff.).

[2] As Walsingham wrote to a correspondent in France: "Cases of conscience, when they exceed their bounds and grow to be matter of faction, lose their nature; and sovereign princes ought distinctly to punish their practices and contempt, though coloured with the pretence of conscience and religion."

Romanists under Elizabeth as equal to the persecution of Protestants under Philip and Mary. Mary's bloody work was the work of four years, and Elizabeth reigned for forty-five. Of the 183 Roman Catholics who suffered under Elizabeth, perhaps every one could have saved his life by explicitly denying the right of the Pope to depose the Queen: *they were not required to abjure their religion.* Nothing short of an abjuration of Protestantism and submission to Rome would have saved any of the three hundred and odd martyrs who were burned under Mary. But persecution, however grievously provoked, is ugly work; and in some of the prosecutions under Elizabeth justice was violated and needless cruelty was inflicted. *The history of the sixteenth century teems with cruelty and injustice*; and the English Reformation is one of those movements of which it is rightly said, that we must not "forget the goodness of the cause in the badness of the agents, nor the badness of the agents in the goodness of the cause."

A *second measure* for the putting down Romish recusancy was the establishment in December 1583 of the *High Commission Court*, with powers which resembled those of the Inquisition. The Act of Supremacy of 1559 had empowered the Queen to exercise her ecclesiastical jurisdiction by Commissioners; and several Commissions had been from time to time appointed. Now, however, a *permanent* Commission was created; and under the Stuarts it became an instrument of great oppression. It con-

sisted of twelve Bishops and thirty-two others : three, of whom one must be a Bishop, formed a quorum.

It should be noted that *the ecclesiastical despotism of Elizabeth was a legal despotism*, for it was based on powers conferred by Parliament. *The despotism of her civil government was illegal,* and was known to be so. But people submitted to it, because the perils of the nation and of the Reformed Church made the Commons unwilling to insist upon their rights against a sagacious and patriotic Queen. Protests were sometimes made ; and, as the perils diminished, the protests became stronger ; until at last Elizabeth and her ministers had to give way.

A *third measure* of defence against Roman intrigue and violence is more pleasing. A *Voluntary Bond of Association* was formed, *for the protection of the Queen's person* and the punishment of all who plotted against her. This Bond was everywhere signed with enthusiasm, and whoever signed was pledged to these objects. In November 1584, Elizabeth's *Fifth Parliament gave statutory sanction to the Bond* ; and it was provided that any attempt to deprive Elizabeth of the crown in favour of another should deprive that other of all right to the succession. Another Act *ordered all Jesuits and seminary priests to leave England within forty days* ; and disobedience was to be treated as treason. The nation was roused, and was terribly in earnest. It was determined to make the transfer of the kingdom to a Romanist Queen and government impossible.

But, *as long as Mary of Scots lived, there was danger.* She was, to all who had espoused the cause of Elizabeth and of Protestantism, a living menace. Her aim was to get Elizabeth to recognize her *as her successor.* As Elizabeth would recognize no one as her successor, Mary considered that she had the right to try to *secure the crown at once.* Her wish to restore Romanism was subsidiary to her desire for the crown. She would have tolerated both religions, if toleration would have made her Queen of England. But her only chance of that was to win Roman Catholic support in England, backed up by the Guises in France and by Philip in Spain. So she posed as a devoted servant of the Papacy and as the foe of Protestantism.

Elizabeth and Mary of Scots are two of the strangest women that ever reigned. Both were very clever, very highly educated, and very ambitious. Both were thoroughly unprincipled, ready to tell any lie, or to ruin anybody, in order to gain their ends. Both were women, and both were Queens: but in Elizabeth it was the Queen who triumphed over the woman, while in Mary it was the woman who triumphed over the Queen. Mary's marriage with *the Dauphin* was wholly a matter of policy. Her marriage with *Darnley* was partly a matter of policy, partly also of passion; and so far as it was a matter of policy, it was a mistake. Her marriage with *Bothwell* was wholly a matter of passion; and it was a fatal mistake: but she cared more for the man than for the crown. It was a blunder on which

Elizabeth looked with sardonic satisfaction, feeling that she herself was incapable of such folly. There was just one man among her many suitors whom Elizabeth would have cared to marry, *Dudley, Earl of Leicester*.[1] But to have married a subject would have lowered the prestige of her crown in Europe; and she cared more for the crown than for the man. She even proposed that Mary should marry Leicester, in order that by wedding a Protestant Mary might be discredited in the eyes of Catholics. She was willing that the man whom she loved should marry her rival, in order that her rival might be politically ruined. That was a sacrifice of which Mary was incapable. But there was this great difference as to their aims. Elizabeth flirted, and lied, and swore, and maltreated her agents, generally to win some advantage for the nation; Mary committed her misdeeds mainly to gratify her own selfish ambition. For Scotland she scarcely cared at all. She wanted husbands, as Elizabeth wanted admirers, for political ends: but Mary was capable of being in love with her husbands, whereas Elizabeth chiefly cared that her admirers should be in love with her. Woe betide them if, being unable to marry the Queen, they ventured to marry anyone else! She gave out early in her reign that, so far as her own inclination went, she desired to remain unmarried. She was perhaps sincere in this; but assuredly she did not wish it to be believed. It is perhaps worth while adding that Elizabeth has left us one or two

[1] See Spenser's *Faery Queene* (I. ix. 13–17).

beautiful orations, and Mary has left us one beautiful prayer (see Appendix).

Putting Mary of Scots in prison was probably a mistake. It made a martyr of her, and added the glamour of romance to a cause which was recognized as the cause of the Church of Rome. Thrilling reports of imaginary sufferings spread over Europe; and a chivalrous enthusiasm for a persecuted woman augmented devotion to the Roman See, where such devotion existed, and was a substitute for it, where it did not. Men might or might not care for the Pope, but the name of the imprisoned Mary Stuart was always something to conjure with. It is remarkable that all the serious attacks on Elizabeth's throne and life, from the Northern rebellion downwards, were subsequent to her making a prisoner of Mary, Queen of Scots.

Probably no one knew then to what extent Mary really was dangerous; but it was certain that *nothing but her death would render success impossible; Ne pereat Israel, pereat Absalom*, as Sir Chris. Hatton said to the House of Commons; and Elizabeth's devoted minister, *Walsingham*, set himself to compass her removal. She was to be allowed to compromise herself so hopelessly, that she would be convicted of treason and brought to the block. No one since Wolsey had such intimate knowledge of continental intrigues as Walsingham. He had spies in every court in Europe, and knew all that was going on. It was said of him that "he heard in London what was whispered in the ear at Rome,"

and that "to him men's faces spake as much as their tongues, and their countenances were indexes to their hearts." In her close confinement at Tutbury, Mary was induced to believe that she could outwit her keepers and correspond with conspirators outside. All the letters came to Walsingham, and revealed a plot "to remove the beast that troubles the world," *i.e.* to kill Elizabeth. *John Ballard*, a Jesuit, and *Ant. Babington*, were the chief plotters. Elizabeth risked assassination for some weeks in order that the plot might ripen. Then the net closed, and *Mary was convicted of treason*, 25th October 1586. Elizabeth was most unwilling to act. She shrank alike from putting Mary to death, and from refusing to put her to death.[1] At last she was induced to sign the death-warrant; and then she begged that it might not be used. Could not Mary be got rid of in some other way? The Council sent the warrant to Fotheringay, whither Mary had been removed, and *she was beheaded 8th February 1587*. Elizabeth pretended to be overwhelmed with grief and indignation. By fining and imprisoning the Secretary, *Davison*, who had charge of the warrant, she tried

[1] "I hope," she said to Parliament, "you do not look for any present resolution from me: for my manner is, in matters of less moment than this, to deliberate long upon that which is but once to be resolved. . . . Whatever the best of subjects may expect from the best princes, that expect from me to be performed to the full." See her letter to James, protesting her innocence of his mother's death (Ellis, *Original Letters*, iii. p. 22). She spent £321, 14s. 6d. on Mary's funeral.

to persuade the world that she was not responsible for Mary's death. In this she has quite failed.

There is *one more attack upon Elizabeth* and her religion to be mentioned. Mary Stuart had sent word to Philip of Spain that she transferred to him her claim to the crown of England ; and Philip's daughter already had some claim, as being descended from John of Gaunt. The *Invincible Armada sailed the year after Mary's death.* It was a supreme effort on the part of Roman Catholicism to overthrow the sovereign who was regarded as the head of Protestantism, and the nation which was regarded as its chief support. "Come let us kill her, and the inheritance shall be ours."

Elizabeth was again at her best in repelling the attack.[1] Her words at Tilbury Fort kindle enthusiasm still. The end for which she had quibbled and been guilty of every kind of inconsistency and meanness, in order to gain time for her subjects to find their bearings, had been accomplished. When the increasing strength of England provoked the great assualt from Spain, it was a united nation

[1] Bacon, in his *Praise of the Queen*, says of her: "When her realm was to have been invaded by an army, the setting forth whereof was the terror and wonder of Europe, it was not seen that her cheer, her fashion, her ordinary manner, was anything altered ; not a cloud of that storm did appear in that countenance wherein peace doth ever shine ; but with excellent assurance and advised security she inspired her council, animated her nobility, redoubled the courage of her people ; still having this noble apprehension, not only that she would communicate her fortune with them, but that it was she that would protect them, and not they her."

that leapt up to repel it. Romanists fought side by side with Anglicans and Independents to beat down the arrogance of a Romanist Monarch, when he attempted to execute the Pope's sentence of deposition on their Queen. *The Armada was the shock which crystallized the fluid elements in England into solidity*; and in the consciousness of the strength of union Elizabeth's subjects forgot how often she had exasperated them by her caprices and her evasions of all decided action. Their amazing success against the Spaniard they attributed to her; and on the medal which commemorated the defeat of the Armada they put the inscription, *dux femina facti*, "It was a woman that led us to victory." Elizabeth's own medal had a humbler inscription: *Deus flavit et dissipati sunt*,—doubtless an echo of the text chosen by the preacher (John Piers, Bishop of Sarum, afterwards Archbishop of York), when she went in state to St. Paul's to give thanks: "Thou didst blow with Thy wind, the sea covered them: they sank as lead in the mighty waters.

We must pass on to *the other great movement* which troubled the Church of England in the days of Elizabeth, and for many generations after her time. This may be called the *Ultra-Reformation*, the persistent attempt of the Puritans, who were almost invariably Calvinist in doctrine, to capture the Church of England and reform it past all recognition. Every link which connected it, not merely

with the mediæval Church, but with the primitive Church, was to be broken and thrown away, excepting those few features which could be found plainly expressed in Scripture.

There are two views of Puritanism, one favourable and the other unfavourable, which are at best only part of the truth; and, unless the other side is supplied, very erroneous opinion must be the result.

The Puritans are sometimes regarded as the champions of liberty. It is said by their friends that they were a standing protest against the despotism in Church and State, and that in the Church they contended for more freedom than was allowed by the Prayer Book. From the same point of view one might say that a rebel is a champion of liberty, because he refuses to be bound by the laws of his country. Yet it *is* true to say that in the *State* the Puritans were opposed to arbitrary power, and therefore their influence tended towards *political* freedom. But in the Church they had no more idea of freedom than the most bigoted Romanist. As Bacon says of them: "These are the true successors of Diotrephes, and not my lord bishops." Religious toleration was still unknown, and assuredly it was not the Puritans who discovered it. They were not a party asking for toleration either inside or outside the Church. *They demanded that the whole Church should be taken to pieces and reconstructed in accordance with their own narrow prejudices*; and they were not prepared to allow to

others any deviation from this Puritan reconstruction. It was an absolute tyranny which they meant to set up, and did set up when they founded their own Church and commonwealth in America:[1] and tyranny is none the less tyranny because it is exercised by a multitude rather than by one man. No; the Puritans have indirectly helped political liberty; but they have been the strenuous opponents of religious freedom.

Again, the enemies of *Puritanism* think of it chiefly as a *destructive force.* This view also is only part of the truth, and therefore may be misleading. Puritanism *has* been destructive. It overthrew altars, pulled down statues, and broke decorated windows; it condemned the theatre and frowned at amusements; it destroyed the monarchy and ignored the aristocracy; it rejected the liturgy and abolished episcopacy. But *Puritanism had also a strongly constructive side.* Its aim was to found a State, a religious State. There was to be a *commonwealth of saints*, in which Christians could grow

[1] "The intolerance with which the puritans had been treated at home might at least have taught them a lesson of forbearance to each other. But it had no such effect. It would almost seem as if, true disciples in the school of the high commission and star chamber, their ambition was to excel their former tyrants in the art of persecution. They imitated, with a pertinacious accuracy, the bad example of their worst oppressors; and, with far less to excuse them, repeated in America the self-same crimes from which they and their fathers had suffered so much in England" (Marsden, *The History of the Early Puritans*, p. 305). This testimony is the stronger, as coming from a fair-minded writer, whose sympathies are on the Puritan side. See p. 415 ff.

up in one prescribed and uniform system, free from all doubts as to what was Gospel truth, and protected against the assaults of all unnecessary temptations. There is an earnestness and reality in this, with which the least puritanical among us can sympathize. It is easy to call them hypocrites; but that does not explain their wide and lasting influence. Hypocrisy cannot sway multitudes as they swayed them; nor suffer for a cause as they suffered. But it is chiefly the tolerance and the destructiveness of Puritanism that we have now to consider.

In Elizabeth's reign there were many English Churchmen who still had an affection for various things in the unreformed religion; and it was a happiness to them to find so many of the old thoughts, and even of the old words, in the new Prayer Book. Again, there were many who, without going all the way with continental reformers, were in favour of thorough reformation; and they were pleased at the breaking down of the rules of compulsory celibacy for the clergy and compulsory confession for the laity, and they liked the doctrinal tone of the Articles and the spirit of personal religion which pervaded the whole book. *Were these two large classes of moderate Churchmen to be hurried into Calvinistic Puritanism?* To this question Elizabeth gave an emphatic *negative*, and in this her influence for good was incalculable. It was sometimes despotically exercised, but it was of the utmost service to the Church and nation. In

the general uncertainty and incoherence, she was the one centre of unity, and she secured time for the disconnected atoms to find out their true affinities and combine. Her aim was to reduce the extremes at both ends as much as possible, that the nation might realize its true religious character. From the outside, the Roman attack, urged on by the Pope, Spain, the Guises, and the Jesuits, was the more conspicuous and alarming. But, on the inside, the Puritan assault, favoured by teachers at the Universities, and by not a few among the Bishops and clergy, was the more perilous and the more lasting. The issue to be decided was *not*, whether leniency might not for a time be shown to those clergy who disobeyed rubrics and left out passages which they disliked in the Prayer Book; *nor*, whether the Prayer Book itself might not here and there be made more Protestant in tone; *but*, whether *the historic Church of England was to cease to exist*, and the religious life of the nation was henceforth to be compressed into the iron system, which Calvin, with an imposing show of logic and of discipline, but with disastrous practical results, had established at Geneva. Of that system some of those who groaned under it said, that it "was *little better than Popish tyranny disguised* and tendered unto them under a new form." And of *Cartwright*, the Cambridge professor who took the lead in advocating this system in England, and who was one of Hooker's great opponents, it has been said, "He was unquestionably learned and devout, but his

bigotry was that of a mediæval inquisitor . . . For the Church modelled after the fashion of Geneva he claimed an authority which surpassed the wildest dreams of the Vatican. . . . With the despotism of a Hildebrand he combined the cruelty of a Torquemada." These are the words of *J. R. Green*, a writer who certainly has no prejudices against Nonconformists, nor any undue bias in favour of the Church. *Hallam* condemns Cartwright and other Puritan leaders in similar terms. It is in the Marprelate Tracts that Puritan virulence is seen at its worst; and it is in the Lambeth Articles (1595) that its Calvinistic theology is formally stated. Elizabeth scouted the latter, and the Archbishop, who had helped to draw them up, had to suppress them. Nor would James I., at the Hampton Court Conference, allow them to be revived.

Here is a specimen of the *lawlessness of the Puritan clergy*. Archbishop *Whitgift* found that the minister at Eastwell left out the Exhortation, the Absolution, *Venite*, *Te Deum*, three Collects, and Litany. In the Communion service he omitted the prayer for the consecration of the elements and everything between the Confession and the administration. In administering he substituted words of his own selection for those in the Prayer Book. At marriages he used a service devised by himself. And of course he never wore a surplice, "the defiled robe of anti-Christ," as Dean Whittingham of Durham called it. This *may* have been an extreme

case; but it was probably quite a common one. The disuse of the surplice and the omission of parts of the service were very frequent. In 1567 the Spanish ambassador said, "In every parish church a different service is held, according to the bent of the minister." A little later J. Howlett remarks that the directions in the Prayer Book are "commonly broken by every minister at his pleasure."

The steadily increasing disquietude at the persistent attempts of Roman Catholic princes and Roman Catholic conspirators to overthrow their Queen, and the ceaseless flow of returning exiles and of controversial pamphlets and letters from Geneva, Zurich, and Frankfort, had given *a growing impetus to the spread of Puritanism* among the clergy and laity, and especially (as Hooker quaintly remarks) among those "whose judgments are commonly weakest by reason of their sex," and who were "diligent in drawing their husbands, children, servants, friends and allies the same way." "But," says he, "be they women or be they men, if once they have tasted of that cup, let any man of contrary opinion open his mouth to persuade them, they close up their ears, his reasons they weigh not; all is answered with rehearsal of the words of John, '*We* are of God: he that knoweth God, heareth *us*'" (Preface, iii. 13).

Yet it was not the dread of Rome, nor the wonderful success of their system at Geneva, nor the enthusiastic proselytizing by women, which gave the Puritans their chief opportunity of success in

England, but the *deplorable neglect of duty*, and sometimes even of the simplest elements of honesty and morality, *on the part of the ministers of the English Church*. There is not much in English history that is more depressing reading than the lives of the large majority of Elizabethan Bishops: but perhaps the reports of the parishes, and of the clergy who were supposed to minister to them, is more dismal reading still. Cecil, when he accompanied the Queen in one of her progresses, exclaimed, "Here be many slender ministers and much nakedness of religion." Men who had been Protestants under Edward, Romanists under Mary, and Protestants again under Elizabeth, were not the best leaders for a bewildered laity. Violent and rapid changes had made them either partisans, or hypocrites, or cowards, or cynics. Two things had greatly reduced the *number* of clergy. Elizabeth and Leicester and some of the Bishops had so *plundered the revenues* that several parishes had to be lumped together in order to make a pittance for a single minister. Secondly, in such uncertain times *thoughtful young men shrank from taking Orders*. Those who did so were often men of neither education nor character. *The able men who still took Orders were mostly Calvinists*, enthusiasts from Oxford or Cambridge, who did not care about poverty, so long as they had a free hand: and even those Bishops, who were not Calvinists themselves, were sometimes unwilling to hamper men who were evidently in earnest about religion. There seem to have been

over 500 clergy who were definitely enrolled as Puritans, and the number of those who were Puritan in their activity was probably much larger.

Elizabeth set herself sternly against the whole movement. She was determined that the grandeur of the Church of England should not be whittled away by narrow-minded fanatics. She had read (she once told Parliament) perhaps more books than any one who was not a professor; and she was specially well read in the Fathers. She would have the English Church show to all the world that it was possible to accept all the light of the New Learning, without throwing away the best elements in primitive Christianity. Sometimes she struck at the "newfangledness," as she called the Puritan innovations, with one of those *shrewd sayings*, which were the delight of her people. When she visited Oxford in 1566, Dr. Humphrey, a bigoted Calvinist, was Regius Professor of Divinity. Like most Puritans, he refused to wear the square cap and the surplice. "Master Doctor," she said to him, "that loose gown becomes you mighty well; I wonder your notions should be so narrow." Sometimes she opposed it by absolutely *forbidding Parliament*, which steadily became more and more Puritan, *to legislate respecting the Church.* Sometimes she opposed it by *insisting that Bishops should see that the Prayer Book was obeyed.* And she did this almost alone. It was against the advice of her ministers that she took the unpopular line of opposing the House of Commons at a time when she had no

friends on the Continent, and was in danger of assassination at home. Against ministers, Parliament, and assassins she relied upon one thing,—*the goodwill of the nation*; and she was willing to risk even that, rather than see the Church of England reduced to an aggregation of discordant conventicles. To quote her own words: "No Prince can be surer tied or faster bound than I am with the link of your goodwill: yet one matter toucheth me so near as I may not overskip,—religion,—the ground on which all other matters ought to take root, and being corrupted may mar the whole tree." This was in 1584. In February 1587 a member named Cope proposed a new Prayer Book; but in deference to the Queen's injunctions the proposal came to nothing. To the Parliament of 1593 she sent a warning not to interfere with the Church. "Mr. Speaker, if you perceive any idle heads, which will meddle with reforming the Church and transforming the commonwealth, and do exhibit any Bills to that purpose, Her Majesty's pleasure is that you do not receive them, until they be considered by those who it is fitter should consider of such things" (Hansard, *P.H.*, i. p. 862).

When Archbishop *Grindal* was slack in putting down the "prophesyings," which fomented religious controversy and favoured Calvinism,[1] she suspended

[1] On the other hand, the Queen's policy of stopping these discussions led on to the decay of preaching which for several generations marked the English Church. Under the thin disguise of the name "Algrind," Grindal's character is sketched by Spenser in the *Shepherd's Calendar* as that of a model pastor.

him. When Burghley remonstrated with Archbishop *Whitgift* for requiring the clergy, not only to subscribe to the Royal Supremacy, the lawfulness of the Prayer Book, and the Thirty-nine Articles, but also to answer articles of inquiry respecting their mode of conducting public worship, Elizabeth stood by the Primate, and would allow none of her Council to molest him. No doubt, the Puritans gave valuable support to her government in the struggle with Rome; but she was not going to allow them to disfigure the Church. As to points of detail, she believed that, like so many difficulties in her reign, if time was allowed, they would settle themselves. It is not easy to believe that Elizabeth herself was a religious woman. But she *knew the importance of religion* both for individuals and for nations; and she was convinced that a mean ritual, and cramped discipline and creed, would never produce a great and free people.

Thus the Queen's determination, backed by her inexhaustible popularity, *saved the Church from disaster*. She had a higher view of episcopacy than the Bishops had themselves, and she forced them to maintain uniformity.

On the other hand, *she was a most shameless plunderer of church property*, compelling Bishops to alienate their estates to herself and her favourites, and sometimes making them promise to do this as a condition of appointing them. She kept Ely vacant for eighteen years, and gave so much of the revenues to the King of Portugal, that he was

jokingly called "Bishop of Ely." But the often quoted letter to Heton, who ultimately became Bishop of Ely,—"Proud Prelate, . . . I will unfrock you,"—is a forgery of the eighteenth century. Hallam (*Hist. of Eng.*, i. p. 224) makes the letter to be addressed to Cox, Heton's predecessor at Ely.

During the reign of Elizabeth the *theology of the Church of England attained form and fulness. Jewel* defended our Church's position against the Romanists, while *Whitgift, Bancroft,* and *Hooker* answered the objections of the Puritans. It is grievous, in treating of this period, to Devonshire people, to give to *Richard Hooker* — born at Heavitree and educated at Exeter School—only a passing mention. But it would require several lectures to do justice to Hooker. In some ways he is the greatest theologian that the English Church has ever produced. But he was a great deal more than an extraordinarily learned, accurate, and philosophic theologian. He showed that it was possible to accept all the light of the New Learning without losing what was best in Christian antiquity; and that fidelity to religion did not involve hostility to the many-sidedness of the world. In an age of bitter and virulent controversy, he showed how a book that is wholly controversial could be written, not only without bitterness, but with a chivalrous determination never to give needless pain. He writes with the charity of a Christian and the courtesy of a perfect gentleman. And beyond all this, he was master of a matchless style. Till he

wrote, no one knew what great things could be done with English prose: and to this day, for stateliness, richness, and force, the language of Hooker remains unexcelled. Merely as literature, the *Ecclesiastical Polity* stands in the first rank.

We must hasten to a close.

In 1592 there appeared on the Continent a pamphlet, written in English and Latin, *Responsio ad Edictum Reginae Angliae*, criticizing with reckless vehemence the repressive measures against Roman Catholics which were taken by the English Government after the Armada. It was attributed to the crafty conversationalist, Parsons. It was too clever to be ignored, and Bacon was commissioned to write a reply. Such a reply could not be impartial. "Besides that it was written to order, no man in England could then write impartially in that quarrel; but it is not more one-sided and uncandid than the pamphlet which it answers, and Bacon is able to recriminate with effect, and to show gross credulity and looseness of assertion on the part of the Roman Catholic advocate. But religion had too much to do with the politics of both sides for either to be able to come into the dispute with clean hands: the Roman Catholics meant much more than toleration, and the sanguinary punishments of the English law against priests and Jesuits were edged by something even keener than the fear of treason" (Dean Church on Bacon's *Observations on a Libel*).

From 1593 to 1603 there was not very much religious strife. In 1594 there was another plot to

assassinate the Queen. The trial of *Rodrigo Lopez*, a Portuguese Jew, for this attempt to compass a Christian's death, very possibly suggested Shylock to Shakespeare.[1]

In October 1601, Elizabeth called her *Last Parliament*, which made a *strong protest against the increase of monopolies.* Elizabeth promised immediate reform. The Commons sent a deputation to thank her and assure her of their unabated loyalty and devotion; and she replied in a speech of the most queenly and touching affection. She loved absolute power; but, when the time for yielding came, she knew how to yield gracefully. It is no paradox to say that her very abuses of power were popular, for she never dragooned her subjects into submission. In her long reign of forty-five years only thirteen sessions of Parliament were held; yet the people did not clamour for more. She shocks *us* by her many mean and unworthy acts; and she irritated *them* by her ceaseless evasions of the problems which came before her. But all the time she was enabling the free spirit of the people to grow. Foreign ambassadors often remarked on the national love of liberty. And when she passed away, early on 24th March 1603,[2] she left a nation which neither needed, nor could long tolerate, the despotic government of either queen or king.

[1] Mr. Courthope, in his *History of English Poetry*, places *The Merchant of Venice* in the period 1596–1600.

[2] The account of the death of Elizabeth in Dodd's *Church History* is said to have been written by Lady Southwell, who was present. The picture of it by Paul Delaroche (1827), now in the Louvre, will be remembered by those who have seen it.

II.

1603–1625.

THE WISE FOOL IN CHURCH AND STATE.

"L'ambition dans l'oisiveté, la bassesse dans l'orgueil, le désir de s'enricher sans travail, l'aversion pour la Verité ; la flaterie, la trahison, la perfidie, l'abandon de tous ses engagemens, le mépris des devoirs du Citoyen, la crainte de la vertu du Prince, l'espérance de ses foiblesses, et plus que tout cela, le ridicule perpétuel jetté sur la Vertu, sont, je crois, le caractère de la plûpart des Courtisans marqué dans tous les lieux et dans tous les tems."

MONTESQUIEU, *De l'Esprit des Loix*, I. iv. 5.

II.

1603–1625.

THE WISE FOOL IN CHURCH AND STATE.

At the end of the sixteenth chapter of *Kenilworth*, Sir W. Scott says that "Elizabeth united the caprice of her sex with that sense and sound policy in which neither man nor woman ever excelled her." We shall miss one of the great lessons of Elizabeth's long reign, if we fail to see that her *caprice was almost as valuable to the nation as her sense and sound policy.* Of the fact of the caprice there can be no doubt; instances abound. *Walsingham* wrote to Wotton, 4th September 1585, respecting the Queen's irresolution: "This fault, through long continued custom, is grown to such a habit, as now is not to be remedied." And *Bacon* says, "Her counsellors were sore troubled to know her will; so covertly did she pass her judgment, as to seem to leave all to their management." Years before, *Burghley* had written to Walsingham (1572), "All that we laboured for and had with full consent brought to fashion . . . was by Her Majesty neither assented to, nor rejected, but deferred." Possibly

some of the caprice, most undignified as it often was in its manifestations, was *assumed*, as a device to gain time; that precious time in which perplexities might vanish, or find their own solution. But the caprice, whether acted or real, was of the greatest educational value to her subjects: it *forced them to think for themselves*, till they were ready to go on without leading strings.

Under Henry VII. the people had been too busy settling their own affairs, after the convulsion of the Wars of the Roses, to trouble themselves about problems in Church or State. Under Henry VIII., Edward, and Mary, such problems had been settled over their heads by the sovereign or the Council. But under Elizabeth despotism was exercised, not so much in settling problems, as in refusing to have them settled. Questions as to whether she was to marry this suitor or that; whether England was to be friends with Spain or with France; whether the Reformation was to be partly undone by the Romanists, or carried a great deal further by the Puritans, were all kept as long as possible undecided.[1] Thus *the nation gained time for realizing its own unity and for making up its mind on great questions.* Parliament became more conscious of its

[1] When she visited Oxford in 1566, versifiers and speakers greeted her with thanks for the blessings of peace, and prayed for the continuance of these benefits: and when she bade farewell to the University after her second visit in 1592, she justly claimed to have made peace her supreme care: *Ab initio Regni mei summa, et praecipua mea solicitudo, cura, et vigilia fuit, ut tam ab externis inimicis, quam internis tumultibus servaretur.*

strength; and we have seen how, in the matter of additional monopolies, Elizabeth showed her sagacity and good feeling in yielding. She would not press the royal prerogative in a question about which her people felt strongly, and expressed their wishes in a constitutional way.

It was to subjects thus educated to think for themselves, to a people that had formed fairly definite opinions upon a number of important questions, to a nation that had found out its own oneness and its own strength in being one, that James VI. of Scotland succeeded as James I. of England. How would he carry on the great Queen's work? In what manner would he bear himself towards the great and growing nation that had been learning how to walk alone?

Both he and his new subjects were from the first freed from one difficulty which had been predicted as likely to follow the death of Elizabeth. *There was no disputed succession.* No less than fourteen possible claimants to the Crown had been counted. The real question lay between the Stuarts, descended from Margaret, daughter of Henry VII., and the Suffolks, descended from her sister Mary; and that question had been settled before Elizabeth died. James was proclaimed by *Cecil* at once; *Sir Robert Carey* started for Edinburgh, and we still have his own account of the famous ride, of the proclamation at Berwick, and of his reception, "be-blooded by great falls and bruises," by the new King. We have also the account of the King's royal progress

to London. Before starting he addressed the Scots in the great Church in Edinburgh after the sermon. He corrected the preacher for saying that Scotland would lament his departure: he was not going to leave them. London was scarcely further off than Inverness, and he would often come back to them. He would make each of the two kingdoms useful to the other. He had expected to need their swords; but now he asked only for their hearts. The writer of the account of the progress thus comments on the entry into Berwick, 6th April 1603.

"Happy day! when peaceably so many warlike English gentlemen went to bring in an English and Scottish King, both included in one person, into that town that many a hundred years hath been a town of the enemy; or at the least held, in all leagues, either for one nation or the other. But the King of Peace have glory, that so peaceably hath ordained a King, descended from the royal blood of either nation, to make that town, by his possessing it, a harbour for English and Scots, without thought of wrong or grudging envy!"

The joyous exclamation was just. That which, at long intervals of time, Roman invaders and Plantagenet and Tudor kings had in vain sought to accomplish by force of arms or intrigue, James now saw before him, almost without an effort,—*the union of the whole island under the rule of one man.* To emphasize this fact, he at once added Scottish members to the Privy Council, and he gave a hearty welcome to *both* the rival parties on the English

side of the border. *Robert Cecil*, the late Queen's Secretary, and the young *Earl of Essex*, were both kindly received. In the Council the Scots had the advantage of being able to see the King when they pleased; and he soon began to give offence by the preference which he showed them. But Cecil and his friends had the real control of affairs, through their intimate knowledge of the details.

To England the union of the two Crowns was immense gain. Raleigh compared it to the union of the houses of York and Lancaster after the Wars of the Roses. Again and again England had failed in its enterprises in Europe, because Scotland had sided with the enemy. Scotland had naturally, but perhaps needlessly, dreaded amalgamation with its more powerful neighbour. Now the dreaded union had come about, without force or fraud, by the mere course of events. *It was a magnificent opportunity for a large-minded sovereign*, or indeed for a series of such rulers. Would the Stuarts be able to use it wisely?

"The *unfortunate* Stuarts." That is the epithet which for generations has been bestowed upon them, and no one can say that it is not true. But it is not the whole truth. The four that reigned in England during the seventeenth century were unfortunate, in that their reigns fell in difficult times; and difficulty is apt to lead to failure. But the failures of the four Stuarts were due much more to their own folly than to the troubled period in which their lot was cast; and the folly in all four

cases was exhibited in much the same way. *They could not discern the signs of the times*: and *they could not look the nation in the face.* With Rehoboamlike shortsightedness they insisted upon retaining and augmenting every particle of power which had ever been possessed by the Crown, regardless of the enormous changes which had taken place since such powers had been exercised.[1] The new doctrine of the *Divine Right of Kings,* put forward by the clergy side by side with the *Divine Right of Bishops,* was adopted by the Stuarts as a self-evident principle, just at the time when Englishmen had become very sensitive about the *traditional rights of Parliament.* The policy of favouring Roman Catholics, begun in the first instance in a spirit of humanity, but continued or dropped afterwards, just as happened to be convenient, was embraced in opposition to the prevalent sentiment of the nation. Similarly, the dislike of Presbyterianism, which James had acquired in Scotland, owing to the dictatorial tone of the Presbyterian clergy, caused the Stuarts to show scant sympathy with the large numbers of their subjects who were either Presbyterian, or at least Puritan, at heart. But perhaps even all this would not have exhausted the characteristic patience of the English nation, if the *foreign policy of the Stuarts* had been in accordance

[1] "The King was determined not to give up what the reformers were determined that he should not keep. . . . The undoing of Charles was not merely his turn for intrigue and double-dealing; it was blindness to signs, mismeasurement of forces, dishevelled confusion of means and ends" (Morley, *Oliver Cromwell,* p. 211).

with national traditions and deep-seated desires. To see England, in its continental relations, "burning what it had adored, and adoring what it had burned," under James I. and Charles I., and to see England dragged through European mud under Charles II. and James II., was more than Englishmen could endure; and it was this enormity, added to the folly of their home policy, which cost Charles I. and James II. their crowns. Yes, the Stuarts have been unfortunate; but their worst sufferings have been the natural fruit of their own shifty and unsympathetic characters.

The reign of James I. falls conveniently into three periods, of nine, six, and seven years respectively. From 1603 to 1612 we have the administration of Burghley's son, Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury; and the turning year, 1612, is marked by the deaths of Cecil and of Henry, Prince of Wales. From 1612 to 1618 James tried to be his own minister; but his "kingcraft" resulted in his being the dupe of the *Spanish ambassador, Gondomar*, and a puppet in the hands of his own *favourites*. The turning year, 1618, is marked by the execution of Raleigh and by the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War. From 1618 to 1625 we have the rapid degradation of monarchy under the influence of *Buckingham*, and the unhappy *marriage-projects* of Prince Charles. These were seven years of rank folly, the prelude to the troubles of the next reign.

It is remarkable that a prince with the ante-

cedents of James I. should have met with a cordial welcome in England. One might have expected that the King of that Scotland which had so often been a thorn in the side of England, and the son of that Queen of Scots whose very existence had been such a menace to England's Queen, would have been looked upon coldly by Englishmen. Must not the statesmen who had put his mother to death, dread his vengeance? Must not the Bishops look askance at a King who had accepted Presbyterianism? Must not the Roman Catholics detest a sovereign who had abandoned the religion of which his mother had been a champion and almost a martyr? All these reasonable anticipations proved false. English statesmen had long since made their peace with James, whose succession they saw to be inevitable. And there is no evidence that James ever did feel strongly about the execution of his mother. His own comment on her sufferings was that she had mixed the cup for herself, and she must drink it.[1] And as to Englishmen generally, perhaps they were all for the moment a little tired of Elizabeth's long reign and uncertain temper; and remained tired of it, until James made them wish her back again. Moreover, all of them gave James the

[1] "It was mainly owing to his inaction and indifference that her hopes that Scotland would take up her cause were not fulfilled. The succession to the English crown was nearer to his heart than his mother's execution" (Häusser, *The Period of the Reformation*, p. 604). But his autograph letter to Elizabeth on his mother's behalf expresses real feeling, and was perhaps the best thing that he ever wrote (Ellis, *Original Letters*, iii. pp. 18–22).

welcome of *hope*. He was to a large extent unknown, and it was possible to hope for a great deal. Anglicans, Puritans, and Roman Catholics, all expected that he was going to do a great deal for them. "The Papists," wrote Bacon at the time, "hope too much."

The enthusiasm for him did not last long, except on the part of the Anglican Bishops. For a good many people the sight of him was enough. He was a most unkingly personage. His legs were too weak for his body, which he made still more heavy by having his clothing thickly padded to turn the point of a possible dagger. His tongue was too large, and when he drank the liquid reappeared at the corners of his mouth. His eyes rolled in a most unpleasing way, when he looked on strange people or strange objects. He could not bear to look at an unsheathed sword, and in respect of almost all danger he was constitutionally timid. The one manly pursuit of which he was fond was hunting; and for this he shamefully neglected his duties. He was very unwilling to show himself to the multitudes that came to see him; indeed, he tried to forbid them from coming; and in this he at once made an unfavourable contrast to Elizabeth.

But he quickly did some popular act, in *checking monopolies* and the abuses of *purveyance*. In one thing, however, he went to an absurd excess, viz. in the *distribution of honours*. He created a number of new peers, and raised or restored existing noblemen. In three months he made

seven hundred knights! Bacon was now, at his own request, made a knight; yet not, as he desired, by himself, but in a batch of three hundred. A wag fixed a notice to the door of St. Paul's, offering to teach weak memories the art of recollecting the titles of the new nobility.

We must pass by, with little more than mention, the somewhat *obscure plot* which was very quickly formed in favour of Arabella Stuart, or perhaps, really, of the Infanta of Spain. One very tangible result of it was that *Raleigh was sent to the Tower* for supposed complicity, and was kept there under sentence of death for thirteen years. But during his long confinement he did not forget the world: on the contrary, he wrote its history, and published it in 1614; and assuredly the world did not forget him. But would that, instead of this ambitious undertaking, he had given us the history of his own times!

The *Hampton Court Conference* claims something more than mere mention, although its importance in the history of this reign may be easily exaggerated or misunderstood. On his way to London James had thrown away an opportunity of allaying religious discontent. The Puritan clergy presented what they called a *Millenary Petition*, implying that it had been signed by 1000 supplicants: but the epithet expressed a wish rather than a fact, for the adherents were only 825. There seem to have been no signatures. Yet a request from 825 ministers was worthy of attention. They wanted

to be freed from cap and surplice, the cross in baptism, baptism by women, the Apocrypha, the ring in marriage, and so forth. James had been sickened of Presbyterianism in Scotland, and objected to being preached at by "elders" who were younger and less learned than himself. But he came from Scotland *with entire ignorance of English character and of the situation in England.* There was no fear of the English Church becoming Presbyterian. This the House of Commons would not have allowed: it wanted to maintain the national Church in the episcopal form. But it would have welcomed concessions made to those who had conscientious objections to certain matters of ritual. *Bacon* gave his weighty advice in favour of making the use of the surplices, the sign of the cross, and the ring *optional*, and of allowing some liberty as to omitting parts of the service. And Bacon was no Puritan. In his mother's house he had seen both the strength and the weakness of Puritanism, and with a sure hand he gives judgment against it. But the self-opinionated King would not listen. He invited four leading Puritans, of his own selection, to meet him and certain Bishops in conference at Hampton Court (January 1604). The leading Puritan was *Dr. Reynolds*, President of C. C. C., Oxford; a Devonshire man (Pinhoe) and perhaps Hooker's tutor. James could not have chosen a better representative of reasonable Puritanism (see Fowler, *History of Corpus Christi College*, chap. vi.). He honestly wished to know what they had to say; and when *Bishop*

Bancroft proposed that the Puritans should not be permitted to speak, because there was an old canon which ruled that schismatics may not be heard when they speak against Bishops, James would not listen to him. He saw the monstrous intolerance of inviting people to a conference and then not allowing them to speak. He called on the Puritan Dr. Reynolds to say his say, and then told Bancroft to answer him. James exhibited much learning, but in a sadly irritating and wrong-headed way. At last he asked Reynolds if he had anything else to urge; and when Reynolds replied in the negative, James exclaimed, "If this be all your party hath to say, I will make them conform themselves, or else I will harry them out of the land, or else I will do worse." (See James's own account of the matter, Ellis, *Original Letters*, third series, p. 162.) He amazed the Bishops themselves by his zeal for episcopacy: *any limitation of episcopal authority he simply refused to discuss.* This was with him not purely a matter of policy, but also of orthodoxy. James was an orthodox Anglican.

And here we may pause for a moment to consider three things: the *position of episcopacy* at this period, the *King's Anglicanism*, and the *King's learning.*

1. At this time *two causes*, from two opposite quarters, *were at work, tending to depreciate episcopacy.* On the one hand, *Romanists* were deliberately lowering the episcopate, in order to exalt the Papacy. Their three orders of the ministry were

the Pope, Bishops or Priests, and Deacons. A Bishop was treated as no more than a somewhat glorified priest. On the other hand, the *Reformers*, in their contest with Rome, wanted as many supporters as possible. They would have lost a great many of these, if they had insisted upon episcopacy, and episcopal ordination, as essential. Hence Puritan Bishops sometimes allowed ministers who had only Presbyterian ordination to be instituted into livings. As a rule, such things attracted no attention: the laity either did not know, or did not care. *There is no case in which such an appointment was challenged as irregular*; and consequently *there is no case in which an ecclesiastical court declared that absence of episcopal ordination was no bar to preferment in the Church of England.* All that such cases prove is that there were plenty of English Churchmen, including some Bishops, who thought little of episcopacy. But among such we must certainly not count King James.

2. This leads us on to the *King's Anglicanism.* As a matter of policy, James was against the democratic sentiment which lay at the bottom of Presbyterianism. He believed that the cry of "No Bishop" led naturally to the cry of "No King"; and that a system in which (as he said) Jack, Tom, Dick, and Will could instruct the King in affairs of state was fatal to monarchy. In the *Basilikon Doron*, which he published while still in Scotland, he says, "I protest before God (and, since I am here as upon my Testament, it is no place for me to lie

in), that ye shall never find with any Highland or Border Thieves greater ingratitude and more lies and vile perjuries, than with these fanatic spirits." But study had led him to the Anglican standpoint, some years before he came to England; and in this he was not unlike his *protégé*, the great continental scholar, *Isaac Casaubon*. Born and educated at Geneva, Casaubon's studies had made him profoundly dissatisfied with Calvinistic methods of dealing with Romanism. The Calvinistic ministers, as a rule, knew nothing of antiquity; and Casaubon saw that in the controversy between Rome and Geneva *it was precisely antiquity that must decide between the two*. His study of primitive Christian literature convinced him that both sides were wrong, and that the truth lay between them. Books reached him from England which took the same line. Sound learning applied to the Fathers showed that there was no need to sacrifice one's reason, either to the presumptuous dogmatism of Rome, or to the ignorant dogmatism of the Calvinists. This *Anglo-Catholic position* was very welcome to Casaubon: and it is worth noting that it was *already in existence long before the ascendency of Laud*. It is sometimes attributed to Laud: but it was the production of no individual. It was mainly, but not quite exclusively, an English production; because it was in England that the nation's moderation held the balance so long, as regards ritual and doctrine, between Roman extravagance and Calvinistic destructiveness. Who was to de-

cide? Papal authority had been rejected. The Sovereign, the Parliament, the Bishops, were either incompetent or prejudiced. Logic proved inadequate, for both sides claimed to have pure reason in their favour. The one thing that could give a decision which might satisfy a fair mind, was *learning*; and *it decided against both Rome and Geneva.* This was the conviction that Casaubon had reached; and when he came to England, at Archbishop Bancroft's invitation in 1610, he found a school of theologians who agreed with him. And it seems to be correct to say that, among those who had reached this position, like Casaubon, by independent study, was Casaubon's royal patron, James I. And this leads us to our third point.

3. It has been a common thing to laugh at the *learning of James I.* No doubt he was a pedant, and was fond of exhibiting the extent of his own reading and of convicting other people of knowing less than he did. But Lingard goes too far in saying that, although the king's learning "won the flattery of his courtiers," yet it "provoked the contempt and derision of real scholars." The esteem which Casaubon had for James, and the liking which he showed for his conversation, is strong evidence that the King's knowledge was by no means contemptible. He read the voluminous works of Bellarmin more than once, and he sent to Cambridge for copies of the Fathers and Councils, in order that he might study the references in the original Greek and Latin. Lord Howard wrote of

him to Harington, "He doth wondrously covet learned discourse." James loved to surround himself with scholars and theologians who could discuss the Fathers and Councils with him; and never before or since has the English Court listened to so much learned conversation. And James was not a mere dictionary or commonplace book: he understood what he had read.[1] He probably overestimated the amount of the knowledge of which he was so proud. But his gravest mistake lay in another direction. He *mistook learning for wisdom*, and thought that knowledge of books qualified him for ruling men. His tutor Buchanan had told him that "a sovereign ought to be the most learned clerk in his dominions," and James appears to have believed that erudition would make him be an excellent king. But it is possible to know many books and many wise maxims, and yet be in conduct and character a fool.

The one substantial good that came of the Hampton Court Conference—and it is one not easy to exaggerate—was the *Authorised Version of the Bible*: but to expatiate upon that would be to trespass upon the province of other lectures. Another fact to be remembered in connexion with

[1] Gardiner says, "His mental powers were of no common order; his memory was good, and his learning, especially on theological points, was by no means contemptible. He was intellectually tolerant, anxious to be at peace with those whose opinions differed from his own. He was above all things eager to be a reconciler, . . . penetrated with a strong sense of the evil of fanaticism" (*History of England*, 1603–42, i. pp. 48, 49).

the Conference is that it marks the beginning of that *fatal alliance between the Crown and the Episcopate*, based on a common claim to Divine Right, and directed against the common foes, Presbyterianism and Puritanism. The war began at once. Ten of those who had supported the Millenary Petition were sent to prison, on the monstrous plea that such a petition was an incentive to rebellion; and hundreds of clergy, who refused to conform, were expelled from their livings. Some Puritans left England for Holland; and thence in 1620 the 120 "Pilgrim Fathers" sailed in the *Mayflower* for New England.

Under Elizabeth the fateful question, *which, in the last resort, is supreme, the Sovereign or the Parliament*, had been kept in the background by the tact of the Queen. In his very first Parliament James raised this dangerous point, and throughout the remainder of his reign never allowed it to sleep. As the strength and firmness of the Commons grew, so also did his assertions of the royal prerogative. He told the Commons that "they derived all matters of privilege from him and by his grant," and therefore their privileges must not be used against his power. Neither his failure to get his claims recognized, nor the indignation which his unconstitutional acts provoked, opened his eyes to the necessity of yielding.

The *142 Canons Ecclesiastical*, which are still nominally in force for the guidance of the English clergy, had been compiled in 1603, and by their

anti-Puritan tendency had given offence to the Commons. The Commons could get no satisfaction from King or Lords, and they retaliated by sharpening the laws against Romanists. Against his wishes, and against the hopes which he had himself encouraged, James was driven to persecute his Roman Catholic subjects. This led to the *Gunpowder Plot, an event which left its mark on the history of the next hundred years.* It led to the imposition of the *Oath of Allegiance* and of new *Penal Laws.* The Oath of Allegiance split the English Romanists into two parties, and thereby weakened them. Some took the Oath, and thereby got terms which, however severe, were a great deal better than those given to Romanists who refused the Oath. The latter were liable to loss of goods and perpetual imprisonment. We must remember that imprisonment often meant a slow and horrible death in gaol: and large numbers were imprisoned. When, in 1616, to help on the Spanish marriage, James released these Romanists, the Puritans lamented that four thousand idolaters had been let loose to pollute the purified land.[1]

[1] "Criminal attempts, even when they fail, have at times the most extensive political consequences. James I. had started with the idea of linking his subjects of every persuasion to himself in the bonds of a free and uniform obedience. Then intervened this murderous attempt; and the measures to which he had recourse in order to secure his person and his country against the repetition of criminal attacks like this last, rekindled the national and religious animosities which he desired to lull, and fanned them into a bright flame" (Ranke, *History of England*, i. p. 417).

The first Parliament obtained the abolition of the abuse of *Royal Proclamations* which had usurped the place of laws. The friction caused by other points in dispute was somewhat allayed by the adroitness of Cecil and by the popularity of Henry, Prince of Wales, who was believed to favour Puritanism, and who openly condemned the foibles of his father. But Parliament, unable to come to terms with the grasping King, was dissolved in 1611; and next year *both Cecil and Prince Henry died.* About the latter there was a prophecy current, the influence of which was felt almost in our day: "*Henry the Eighth pulled down abbeys and cells; Henry the Ninth will pull down bishops and bells.*" When *William IV.* came to the throne, he wished to take the title of Henry IX.; but his advisers told him of the old-wives' prediction, and persuaded him to assume the name by which he is known in history.

We now begin the *second period*, 1612–1618. When Cecil died, in 1612, James raised a young Scotch favourite, Robert Carr, to high positions, and made him *Earl of Somerset.* His influence was utterly evil. Somerset married Lady Francis Howard, the divorced wife of the Earl of Essex. To the scandal of the nation, the divorce had been obtained through the outrageous interference of the King and the equally outrageous management of the trial by *Bilson,* Bishop of Winchester, who was thenceforth known as "Sir Nullity Bilson." The

marriage of the divorced wife with Somerset had been opposed by *Sir Thomas Overbury*, who on a frivolous charge was sent to the Tower, where he was poisoned by the Somersets. The truth came out two years later, and the Somersets were tried and found guilty. James pardoned, but dismissed them; and George Villiers, afterwards *Duke of Buckingham*, then took the place of royal favourite. His influence over the King and his second son, Charles, who was now heir to the Crown, was such that he soon became the wealthiest and most powerful peer in the kingdom. To raise money for his and other extravagances, James sold peerages at £10,000 a piece, and created Baronets, each of whom paid £1000 for his patent.

But *all three*, James, Charles, and Buckingham, were more or less *dupes in the hands of the Spanish ambassador Gondomar*, who had the principal ministers of the Crown in his pay. To the end of his life Robert Cecil received a salary from Spain; what Spain got for it we do not know. We are all of us familiar with the saying that "the English are a nation of shopkeepers." The saying perhaps owes its currency chiefly to the first Napoleon, who, when he was irritated against the English, would exclaim, "They are a nation of shopkeepers; *sono mercanti*, as Paoli used to say." Paoli perhaps ought to know, for he ended his days in England as the pensioner of the British Government. But the saying is much older than Paoli's time. Gondomar, in writing home to Spain from the court of

James I., reported that the English could be bought and sold, just like so many *shopkeepers.*

James, who had expected to be in clover in wealthy England, found that Elizabeth had left him a heavy load of debt. In spite of his oppressive measures in raising money, he was always in difficulties, owing to his heedless extravagance. In 1614 he was obliged to call a *second Parliament.* In it Bacon, as M.P. for Cambridge, tried to mediate; but mediation was impossible. In it Pym appeared for the first time as M.P. for Calne; Sir Thomas Wentworth as M.P. for Yorkshire; and Sir John Eliot as M.P. for St. Germains. A House thus composed was not to be talked over. It would grant no money without redress of grievances; and James would concede nothing. It was dissolved after a few weeks of haggling. It was known as the *Addled Parliament,* because not a single egg of legislation was hatched. This led to the King's raising money at home by the highly unpopular device of *benevolences*; and to his attempting to get money from abroad, and from no other than the hereditary foe of England, *Spain.* James had long had a hankering for a Spanish alliance. He had the fine idea of getting the chief Catholic power to join with the chief Protestant power in compelling the rest of Europe to live in peace. *Beati pacifici,* "Blessed are the peacemakers," was one of the many excellent sayings which he was so frequently uttering, without in the least knowing the right way of carrying them into practice. In the case of the

Spanish project, he spoilt everything by his petty bargaining ways, and by *turning the proposal into a device for filling his own pockets.* He sent to Spain an *offer of marriage between his son Charles and the Infanta*, chiefly for the sake of the large dowry which would be paid with such a princess.[1]

This was the most unpopular act of his whole life, and in the eyes of his subjects he never recovered from it. From every point of view the proposal was hateful to them. (1) It would be an *alliance with a detested country:* the Armada of 1588 was still fresh in men's minds. (2) It would result in a *Romanist* from a bigoted and intolerant nation *becoming Queen of England*, who would use all her influence to strengthen Papalism in the kingdom. (3) It was an *attempt to circumvent the constitution*, by obtaining money, which had been refused by Parliament, from foreigners.

To no one was Spain more hateful than to *Sir Walter Raleigh*, shut up in the Tower since 1603 on an unproved charge of high treason. In 1615 he was released, on a promise to James that he would go and fetch gold from mines which were said to exist in South America near the Orinoco. The expedition inflicted some damage on the Spaniards in those parts, but brought home no gold. *On the complaint of the Spanish ambassador*, Raleigh

[1] "I have seen the originals of about twenty letters which he wrote to the prince [Charles] and that duke [Buckingham] while they were in Spain, which show a meanness as well as a fondness that render him very contemptible" (Burnet, *History of His Own Time*, i. p. 32).

was arrested. And, as James did not dare to try a man in public for having inflicted a blow upon Spaniards, *Raleigh was in 1618 put to death on the old sentence for high treason*, pronounced years before. This made the idea of a Spanish alliance still more hateful to the nation. One of the most popular men in England seemed to have been sent to the scaffold simply to please the detested Spaniards.

But James had not yet reached the lowest depth of unpopularity with his subjects. This took place in the *seven years of special folly which bring the reign to a close*, 1618 to 1625. In 1618 the *Thirty Years' War* broke out, in which James' daughter *Elizabeth* and her husband, the *Elector Palatine*, seemed to stand out on the Continent as the representatives of deserted Protestantism. The Elector was defeated, and part of his dominions was seized by Spain. Englishmen were very indignant that their King should stand by and see his desired allies, the Spaniards, defeat and rob his daughter's husband. James sent ambassadors to various courts in Europe to endeavour to get other powers to interfere. But all this diplomacy effected nothing, and *the whole of his foreign policy was regarded by the nation with the profoundest dislike and distrust.*

Nor did his *home government* inspire less aversion or suspicion. The *influence of the favourite Buckingham* had almost supplanted the authority of the Crown, whether rightful or assumed. Men who wished for office or favour found that, in order to

succeed, they must cringe to a man who, when he first came to court, had to borrow the money to pay for a court suit. Moreover, to have Buckingham's goodwill was to be above the laws. His friends could not only obtain promotion over the heads of the deserving, but could defy justice. The *extravagance of the royal expenditure* was known to be largely his doing. And whereas the gaiety of Elizabeth's court had often been a distress to Puritans, the *shameless indecency of the court* in which Buckingham was the leading spirit, was such as to shock anyone who valued sobriety or modesty. In this respect the court of James I. was far worse than even the licentious court of Charles II.

But in the home government of James I., that which specially moved the indignation of his subjects was his attempts to *tamper with the course of justice.* Again and again he had got the judges to give decisions, of very questionable equity, in favour of the Crown. In 1616 he induced eleven of the twelve judges to promise that, if, in any case that was being tried before them, the King were to intimate that his interests were at stake, *they would stay the proceedings until he had consulted with them.* The *Chief Justice Coke* would promise nothing of the kind, but merely that, whenever such a case should come before him, he would *do what was fitting for a judge to do.* For this he was censured by the Council, and in November he was told that he had ceased to be Chief Justice. *The Royal prerogative*

was now freed from the danger of adverse decisions in courts of law. But it was also *freed from all the moral support* which unfettered decisions of courts of law could give it. The nation's respect for legal judgments in favour of the Crown ceased, as soon as it was known that English judges were no longer independent ministers of justice, but creatures of the Crown, who held office simply during the sovereign's pleasure. It is painful to remember that Bacon helped to bring this about.

Consequently, when the *third Parliament* of James I. met in 1621, it met in deep-rooted distrust of his whole policy both abroad and at home. This is a *Parliament which deserves to be remembered.*

1. On the motion of the late Chief Justice Coke, a committee to inquire into grievances was appointed, and *monopolies* were at once attacked. This led to the *revival of the ancient right of Parliamentary Impeachment*, which had been dormant since the impeachment of the Duke of Suffolk in 1449. Under the Tudors, *Bills of Attainder* and the *Star Chamber* were the common instruments. With the return of the spirit of liberty, the more popular method of dealing with great offenders returned; and *in the seventeenth century there were about forty cases of impeachment.* Since the Bill of Rights, impeachment has been less and less required, and it is now just a century since it was employed. The last case was against *Lord Melville in 1805* for alleged malversation in

office. *In 1621 the Commons impeached Sir Giles Mompesson and Sir Francis Mitchell* for fraud, violence, and oppression in the monopolies which they held. Impeachments were also launched against Field, Bishop of Llandaff, and others. But far more important than any of these was the *impeachment of the Lord Chancellor, Francis Bacon*, for taking presents from those whose cases he tried. He was probably right in pleading that he never allowed these presents to influence his decisions. But Parliament was certainly right in maintaining that Lord Chancellors, like Cæsar's wife, must be above suspicion. The constitutional interest of Bacon's case is that it *re-established the right of impeaching a minister of the Crown.* Like Mompesson and Mitchell, he was sentenced to be degraded, fined, and imprisoned. That Buckingham was unable to save the Lord Chancellor shows the growing strength of the Commons. More than twenty charges were made against Bacon, and admitted by him as true,—charges, not of unjust judgments, but of having taken gifts from suitors. His judgment on his own condemnation is not far wrong: "I was the justest judge that was in England these fifty years. But it was the justest censure in Parliament that was these two hundred years." As Coke remarked, "a corrupt judge is *the* grievance of grievances."

2. In its autumn session *the Commons petitioned the King to abandon the Spanish marriage, to wed his son to a Protestant princess*, and *to send an army*

to the Palatinate. James peremptorily forbade them to "meddle with mysteries of State." *They* claimed their ancient privileges. James replied that they had none, excepting those which the Crown allowed them; and that, if they wished to retain these privileges, they must respect his prerogative. On the 18th December they made a forcible *Protestation* of their "liberties, franchises, privileges, and jurisdictions." James sent for the *Journals of the Commons,* and in the presence of his Council *tore out the Protestation with his own hand.*[1] On 8th February he dissolved Parliament, and *sent Coke, Selden, Pym, and others to prison.* It is noteworthy that at this crisis some of the *Lords* sided with the Commons, and of these the Earl of Oxford was sent to the Tower. But, in all this, the insulting language and action of the King irritated, without impressing his people. He claimed that, as it is "atheism to dispute what God can do . . . so is it presumption and high contempt in a subject to dispute what a king can do." They claimed their constitutional rights. There was no possibility of compromise "between a king resolved to be absolute,

[1] This volume of the *Journals,* with the remainder of the torn pages, may be still seen in the House of Commons. The action of James "laid bare the weakness of a king who imagined that he could annihilate with a leaf out of the Journal-book what could not be erased from History, nor from the hearts of the people" (Häusser, *Reformation,* p. 613). It was in the next year (1622) that the University of Oxford in Convocation condemned all resistance to a reigning sovereign for any reason whatever;—a strange contrast to the House of Commons!

and a people resolved to be free" (Macaulay on Hallam).[1]

In his home policy the most serious difference between the King and his Parliament or people was in respect to *religion*. They wanted relief for Puritan consciences; and he, backed up by the Primate and other bishops, insisted upon the strictest conformity. They wanted careful repression of Romanists; and he was anxious, when convenient, to give Romanists indulgences; for Sir Dudley Carlton, who had been ambassador in Spain, had told him that the priests there threatened to have James killed, if he were not more tolerant to Romanists. Closely connected with this was the still more serious difference between him and his subjects respecting *his foreign policy*. They abominated everything Spanish; and he wanted an alliance with this ultra-Roman and anti-English power. They wanted him to go to war for the Protestant Elector, who had married his daughter; and he insisted upon the blessings of peace and his own skill in diplomacy. Before the end of 1622, the Palatinate was lost to the Elector and in the hands of his foes.

Then came the *ill-advised journey of Charles, Prince of Wales, and Buckingham to Spain*, to try to gain a wife for Charles and the restoration of

[1] James said to Gondomar: "I wonder that my ancestors should ever have permitted such an institution as the House of Commons to have come into existence. I am a stranger, and found it here when I arrived, so that I am obliged to put up with what I cannot get rid of."

the Palatinate to the Elector. James was pleased at this scheme, not only as likely to be very profitable, but as being rather romantic. He had gone himself in early days to bring home his newly married consort from the icy North; and now he sent his son to the sunny South to win a well-dowered bride.[1] The two adventurers travelled as Tom and John Smith. They were fêted in Spain, but Philip IV. was anything but pleased to see them. He asked, What would Charles do for Catholics in England? With true Stuart facility, Charles was ready to hint at large concessions: but Philip asked for deeds. Meanwhile the English were seriously anxious about the Prince of Wales. He might be drowned at sea; or assassinated in Spain; or made to turn Romanist;[2] or be successful in winning the Spanish Infanta. When, after eight months, he returned safe and sound, still a Protestant, and still disengaged, the people broke out into the wildest rejoicings;[3] and even Buckingham enjoyed

[1] The Hardwicke Papers contain a correspondence between James and the two travellers. His first letter to them begins thus: "My sweet boys and dear ventrous knights, worthy to be put in a new romanso." They write back to their "Dear dad and gossip." See Ranke, *History of the Popes*, ii. p. 224, for other reasons which may have influenced James in this undertaking. See also the correspondence in Ellis, *Original Letters*, iii. pp. 121 ff.

[2] James Howell, who was there, states in his Letters that although Charles had two chaplains with him, he never attended the service of the Church of England while he was in Madrid.

[3] "Our belles rung all that day, and the Towne made bonefires at night. Tuesday the belles continued ringing. Every College had a speech and one dish more at supper, and bonefires and squibbes in their courts." Cambridge, 11th October 1623.

for a short time something like popularity. Charles now wrote to Spain and demanded the restoration of the Palatinate as a condition of his marriage with the Infanta; and Philip then put an end to the negotiations. Charles was piqued, and resolved to take vengeance on Spain.

When the *fourth and last Parliament* of James I. met in 1624, it was quite ready to support action against Spain and for the recovery of the Palatinate; and it voted about £300,000. It also confirmed its right to call ministers of the Crown to account by *impeaching Cranfield, Earl of Middlesex, Lord Treasurer of England,* for bribery and other offences. It also passed a *declaratory Act against monopolies* and dispensations with penal laws. Then came the summer recess; and 29th May James dissolved, but not before Charles had promised to Parliament that, if he married a Romanist, no favours should in consequence be granted to Romanists in England. In the Autumn *Charles became engaged to Henrietta Maria, sister of Louis XIII. of France*; and he and James promised to grant the very favours to Roman Catholics which Charles had promised to Parliament should not be granted. Hence it was determined that James should not summon another Parliament until the marriage was over. The marriage of a Roman Catholic Princess to a Protestant of course required a papal dispensation; and the Pope joined with the French court in turning the screw tighter and tighter upon James and Charles respecting

the favours to be granted to English Roman Catholics as a condition of the marriage.

But at last, after nine years of negotiations and embassies to gain a princess for his son, and after vexatious failures and rebuffs and humiliating concessions, *James succeeded in obtaining a definite settlement*, including the papal dispensation. But he did not live to witness the marriage. He had long been failing in health, and allowing Buckingham and Charles to do what they pleased with even more than his customary indolence. He fell seriously ill in March, obstinately refused to take medicine, and died on the 27th. His deathbed was the scene of a religious demonstration. In the presence of a numerous assembly, he received the Holy Communion after the Anglican use, that all men might know that he died holding the views which he had professed and contended for in his writings during his lifetime. By solid conviction, during the whole of his reign, he had been, neither Romanist nor Puritan, but an Anglican.

What advantages did the Church of England obtain from, or during the reign of, James I.? (1) James conferred an immense benefit upon the Church by rendering *all transfers of ecclesiastical estates to the Crown illegal.* It was by means of such transfers that Elizabeth had plundered the Church and reduced some sees and livings almost to beggary: and her successor put a stop

to this flagrant abuse. For this he deserves the gratitude of all who think that an Established and Endowed Church is worth keeping.

(2) Gratitude is also due to him for the part which he took in furthering the production of the *Authorised Version.* But he never subscribed a shilling towards the expenses of the undertaking. Dr. Reynolds, the Puritan President of C. C. C., Oxford, urged it. Bishop Bancroft opposed it. James approved it, partly to conciliate the Puritans, partly because he detested the Genevan Version and its alleged "seditious and traitorous notes." He thought that abuse of the Genevan Version would please Anglicans and allay suspicion. When the King had once set them to work, both sides cordially co-operated in the great enterprise.

(3) The *Canons Ecclesiastical* (compiled from various articles, injunctions, and synodical acts), which were passed by the Southern Convocation in 1604, may be counted as another gain. They were adopted by the Northern Convocation, and authorized by the Crown; but *they have never received the sanction of Parliament.* Consequently the Court of King's Bench has declared them to be not binding upon the laity, excepting so far as they embody statute law. And of course they are not binding on anyone where they have been cancelled by statute law. But although many of their provisions refer to a state of things which no longer exists, they are still of weight in deciding certain

ecclesiastical points, and they have for three centuries helped to preserve the Church from the eccentricities of individual ministers. It is to be regretted that they are now so seldom printed as an appendix to the Book of Common Prayer.

(4) More difficult to estimate is the advantage which the Church of England got from the *unyielding line which James adopted with regard to Puritan objections* to some of the contents of the Prayer Book. That, by the strictness with which he and Archbishop Bancroft insisted upon subscription and conformity, the English Church lost some able and earnest ministers, need not be doubted; and perhaps some indulgence to those who were already in possession might have been politic, however strict the regulations might be for those who should be instituted after a fixed date. But it is difficult to feel much sympathy for men who had entered the ministry of the Church of England, *knowing that they could not conscientiously comply with its requirements*, and deliberately intending to violate its rules while they struggled to get them changed. To work for what you believe to be reformation is one thing: to enter an institution and eat its bread, while you disobey its constitution and try to revolutionize it, is quite another.

(5) It is possible to speak much more confidently with regard to the policy, inherited from Queen Elizabeth, of *making the laity*, whether Puritan or

Romanist in their convictions, *attend the services of the Established Church*. The effect of that upon the Church itself was wholly calamitous; for thereby its spiritual character was placed in peril. External adhesion to the Church, manifested by being present at public worship, was made a test, not of religious conviction, but of *loyalty to the sovereign*.[1] The compulsory attendance of adults at services to which they had conscientious objections was abominable to all who loved liberty. It was probably more abominable to Puritans than to Romanists; and many Puritans stayed away and held services of their own. After the invasion of the Jesuits and the seminary priests, Romanists did the same. But the loyalty of the Puritans to the government was not seriously doubted, and they were not very often prosecuted for breaking the law of attendance at public worship; whereas Roman Catholics rarely escaped punishment. But it must be remembered that in that age *religious toleration was unknown*. No party either gave it or expected it. Toleration of another creed was supposed to mean that the creed was recognized as true. Toleration means no more than that a creed has a right to exist. But it cost two more centuries of strife to get this realized.

It is, however, little or *no excuse for the intolerant and despotic acts of James* I., or of any of the Stuarts,

[1] As Bishop Earle in his *Micro-cosmographie* remarks: "A Church-Papist is one that parts his religion betwixt his conscience and his purse, and comes to church, not to serve God, but the King."

to say that acts as intolerant and despotic were committed by Elizabeth. What was excusable or even politic in her case was inexcusable and worse than impolitic in theirs: and that for two reasons. First, she and they reigned over *totally different generations of Englishmen.* Secondly, although the acts in each case may have been similar, they were *done in a very different spirit.* The Englishmen whom Elizabeth ruled were in the condition of schoolboys and undergraduates, to whom perfect liberty would have been a curse rather than a blessing. The Englishmen over whom the Stuarts tried to domineer were full-grown men, who not only knew the value of liberty, but knew that they had a right to it, and felt that they could use it. Again, the despotism of Elizabeth was exercised not only *for* the good of the people, as she understood it, but also *with* their consent and goodwill. She had nothing else to rely upon; no standing army, no bureaucracy, no network of police. Her absolutism was based on her people's attachment to her person and her Crown. The absolutism which the Stuarts tried to exercise had at every point to be enforced. It was carried on in defiance of the wishes of the people publicly and constitutionally expressed.

(6) And this leads us on to one marked feature in the Church under James I. and his successors, which was altogether new, and altogether disastrous to both Church and State,—the *doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings.* This doctrine, upheld by

a number of English theologians and lawyers for about a hundred years, as if it was a part of revealed truth and a corner-stone of the English constitution, is no mediæval superstition living on into a more enlightened age. The mediæval clergy had thrown their influence the other way, by insisting on limitations to the royal power. We can find the *beginnings* of it in writers near the end of Elizabeth's long reign; *e.g.* in Hooker. But, as a doctrine, strenuously contended for with the pen, preached from the pulpit, and urged as a principle in politics, it comes in with James I., and it goes out with James II., or at any rate with his daughters. It is now as dead as Queen Anne; and it is marvellous that such a doctrine, in such a country as England, should have found a school of supporters, and sometimes able supporters, for so long. It has no foundation in Scripture; nor in history, whether Jewish or English; and it certainly finds none in common sense. It was an enthusiasm, a passion, a craze, which seemed to have an element of chivalry in it, and thereby attracted some generous minds. Of course royalty smiled on it, and it had all the advantages of court favour. James had given it support in his *True Law of Free Monarchies*, written while he was in Scotland. Moreover, not a few prelates gave it their blessing. These things perhaps suffice to explain its success. But, at any rate, the age which has seen the dogma of Papal Infallibility accepted and maintained by a large fraction of the human race, need not marvel that

the doctrine of the Divine Right of Kings found a considerable number of Englishmen to support it for just about a century.

The doctrine of course means a great deal more than that "the powers that be are ordained of God." St. Paul could teach that respecting Nero; and it applies to oligarchies and democracies as well as to monarchies, whether elective or hereditary. The doctrine means that *by Divine ordinance there is an indefeasible hereditary right of succession to the Crown.* Whatever popular election or Acts of Parliament may decide about the succession, there is only one person to whom the Crown belongs, viz. the heir-at-law; and to him it belongs by Divine decree. Whatever may exist *de facto*, there is always a sovereign *de jure*, whose rights are inalienable. This doctrine, so far as it was adopted by the clergy, *did the Church serious harm*, bringing it into needless collision with English tradition and feeling. It allied itself with the slavish doctrine of the duty of *Passive Obedience* to tyrants. It perplexed tender consciences, and made political settlements, which cut across the doctrine, difficult and precarious.

The character of James I., unlike those of Elizabeth and Mary of Scots, is not difficult to read. With one exception (his revolting fondness for coarse buffoonery), the qualities which were fatal to him were foibles rather than vices; and some of

the foibles would have been harmless, or amusing, in a private individual. He might have shone as a country gentleman with literary tastes; but he was pitiable as a prince. In some respects an able and well-read man, he had such an overweening opinion of his own kingcraft, that he committed greater blunders than a more stupid man would have done. His quick understanding and frequent good judgment were more than neutralized by his vanity, his credulity, and his deep-rooted prejudices. With his mouth full of maxims of the highest political wisdom, he sometimes acted in a way which seemed to be evidence of political imbecility. *His besetting fault was a love of ease.* Business was shirked and left to others, who served their own ends by it. Hence he easily became the victim of flatterers and favourites; and he had the misfortune to fall into the hands of very worthless favourites, who traded on his easy-going temper. Much of the evil which he allowed he did not really like; but it was less trouble to allow it than to correct it; and, as he confessed to his first Parliament, he was always too ready to yield to suitors. And this perhaps explains the extraordinary vacillations of a man who at times could be as obstinate as a mule. He said and unsaid things, made promises and broke them, began projects and abandoned them, simply to save himself trouble. Something has already been said about his learning. He was a considerable author, and his writings still find admirers. He specially affected divinity and demonology; the result of the

latter study being that almost every year of his reign some unfortunate woman was put to death for witchcraft.

In the *Fortunes of Nigel*, Sir Walter Scott represents James as saying to George Heriot: "O Geordie, Jingling Geordie, it was grand to hear Baby Charles laying down the guilt of dissimulation, and Steenie lecturing on the turpitude of incontinence." And it is no less "grand" to learn from James himself that kings should test men's talents and characters, and appoint their ministers and servants, not according to their own inclinations, but according to the merits of the men whom they select. But saying and not doing is too common in this world, for us to be amazed that the man who could write that should make a Duke of Buckingham and an Earl of Somerset of a George Villiers and a Robert Carr. And here once more James *contrasts very unfavourably with his great predecessor.* Elizabeth had her favourites, and some of them were not paragons of excellence; but they look very tolerable beside Somerset and Buckingham. And though she showed them much favour, she never allowed them for one moment to rule England or to rule her. "I will have no master here," she said, "and only one mistress." But the greatest contrast of all lies in *the judgment which the nation has passed,* and never reversed, respecting the last of the Tudors and the first of the Stuarts. In spite of some grave shortcomings, the memory of Elizabeth is still revered and loved; and, in spite of some estimable

qualities, the memory of James I. is disliked and despised.[1]

[1] Bishop Burnet says: "It is certain no king could die less lamented or less esteemed than he was. . . . His reign in England was a continued course of mean practices. . . . The great figure the crown of England had made in Queen Elizabeth's time, who had rendered herself the arbiter of Christendom and was the wonder of the age, was so much eclipsed, if not quite darkened, during this reign, that King James was become the scorn of the age" (*History of His Own Time*, i. p. 29).

III.

1625–1640.

DEVELOPMENT OF DESPOTISM IN CHURCH AND STATE.

"Great Charles, among the holy gifts of grace
Annexèd to thy person and thy place,
'Tis not enough (thy piety is such)
To cure the called *King's-Evil* with thy touch . . .
What can the poet wish his King may do,
But that he cure the People's Evil too?"

BEN JOHNSON (1630).

III.

1625–1640.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF DESPOTISM IN CHURCH AND STATE.

Charles I. was twenty-five years of age when he ascended the throne. He was not equal to his father in either intelligence or learning: but in moral qualities he was superior. And some of the qualities which adorned his character were such as would find special favour with the majority of his subjects. All of them would rejoice that he reproduced the economy of Elizabeth, rather than the extravagance of James I.; and that in doing this he knew how to be careful without showing meanness. And most of his subjects, but especially those of Puritan tendencies, would see with satisfaction that, whereas James could find amusement in coarse indecency and cared for few serious pursuits other than learned conversation, Charles had a modesty which bordered upon bashfulness and a predisposition to gravity in advance of his years. He had his father's love of hunting, but without his father's timidity about almost every form of physical danger.

He could sit a restive horse, and looked well in doing so; and he was an adept in most knightly accomplishments. These were just the characteristics which might have endeared him to the populace. Yet *there is no sign that*, even during the first weeks of his reign, *Charles was received with anything like enthusiasm.*

There were three reasons for this: 1. Charles was not the eldest son; and people still remembered, and perhaps idealized, the popular young prince who had died thirteen years before. 2. For years Charles had been known as the devoted and submissive friend of the detested Buckingham. 3. The nation had long been in a serious mood; and it was too intent upon the task of recovering and securing its liberties from the encroachments of the royal prerogative to spend much feeling upon the new representative of the prerogative. It did not care to commit itself to expressions of loyalty or affection, which might impede it in the work which lay before it. Better that its heart should not go out too warmly towards a prince with whom it would at once have to contend for security of property and person. England was tired of his father's shiftiness, and the air of mystery which he loved to throw round his intentions, in order that he might change them as often as he pleased. *It wanted a king* who would be *frank and straightforward*; who would *abide by the constitution*; and who would *throw himself unreservedly on to the side of Protestantism* in England and in Europe. It

cannot be said that the opening scenes of the reign were such as to show the nation that its desires were likely to be fulfilled, and that it might safely give free course to feelings of devotion and confidence. As Bolingbroke said, Charles came to the throne a party man, "and continued an invasion on the people's rights, while he imagined himself only concerned in the defence of his own."

There was no change in the principal actor upon the political stage. Seldom in history has the same person contrived so completely to monopolize the favour of two kings in succession as did the first *Duke of Buckingham.* With Charles he was even more influential than with James, who sometimes had not only to be won over to a particular course, but also to be induced to stick to it, and who in his old age had become rather impatient of control of any kind. Charles was generally willing to accept Buckingham's advice and to abide by it, with all the confidence that would have been suitable, if his courtier counsellor had combined the sagacity of Burghley with the wisdom of Bacon.

But the principal actor now has a *colleague,* who in the end took his place. For three years longer Buckingham was to be first in the State. But at his side we now find the man who is to become *by far the most commanding ecclesiastical figure in this reign, William Laud,* as yet only Bishop of St. David's and Prebend of Westminster, but already of great influence.

James had got to know Laud at Oxford, and in

1616 took him with him to Scotland, where with characteristic offensiveness he told the Scottish divines that "he had brought some English theologians to enlighten their minds." As soon as Laud had become intimate with Buckingham, the two became close allies. Laud was preaching at Whitehall, 27th March 1625, when the news came of the King's death.[1] Charles at once appointed him to preach at the opening of his first Parliament; and he had to act as Dean of Westminster at the Coronation. It is perhaps from the Coronation of Charles I. that we may date the specially close tie between the two men; for it may have been then that Laud became Buckingham's *confessor*.[2]

That Buckingham had religious convictions, and at intervals had religious moments, need not be doubted. Some of the most vicious men have had both. And there is nothing surprising in his seeking a confessor, or in his asking Laud to act as such. He recognized in Laud a devout man, with the instincts of a statesman, who would be able to understand a statesman's temptations and failings.

[1] "I ascended the pulpit, much troubled, and in a very melancholy moment, the report then spreading that his Majesty King James, of most sacred memory to me, was dead. Being interrupted by the dolours of the Duke of Buckingham, I broke off my sermon in the middle" (Laud's *Diary*).

[2] On 15th June 1622, Laud enters in his Diary: "I became C. to my Lord of Buckingham." Prynne in his *Breviate* interpreted this "C" as "Confessor." Laud wrote in the margin: "If I became his Confessor, it was no ways fit to write down those passages in paper." "C." perhaps meant "Chaplain," and Laud became Buckingham's Confessor at a later (or earlier) period.

But the *close friendship between Buckingham and Laud* is certainly something more than surprising. The incongruity between the two men is so great, that their coming before the world as bosom friends is grotesque. Would that Vandyck, who has left us such winning portraits of Charles I., had given us Buckingham and Laud arm in arm! The brilliant and butterfly favourite, with his gay silk clothing, his white plume and his rapier, his chains and his jewels,[1] his graceful bearing and his courtier manners; and the grave University don, with his stiff, short figure and black dress, and his head surmounted by the square cap, which was such an abomination to Puritans;—truly they are a strange pair! And they are stranger still when one looks below the surface. *Laud*, the learned theologian who had discomfited the Jesuit Fisher, the rigid Anglican, the determined ecclesiastic; and *Buckingham*, the schemer in politics and the gallant in society, ready for any intrigue either with statesmen or women, the accomplished dancer and the ready duellist! But there is no need to suggest that either of them was insincere in professing friendship for the other. They had one of the ties which Aristotle tells us is a basis for friendship: they could be very useful to one another. And, in the first instance, this was Laud's reason for seeking intimacy with Buckingham: he wanted his help.

[1] See the description in Lingard, vii. p. 155 note, from Hardwicke Papers, i. 571, and see Ellis, *Original Letters*, iii. p. 189 note.

Then, when circumstances compelled them to see a great deal of one another, each took a fancy to the other. Unlike as they were in most things, they were both very courageous men and very tenacious of purpose. Both wished to influence the King, and on the whole in the same way. And Clarendon seems to be right in giving to Buckingham one characteristic which anyone would find charming, —especially in contrast to his royal friend and nominal master,—his "want of dissimulation." Nor need we doubt that Laud was inspired with a genuine wish to restrain this spoilt child of fortune from his evil ways. The prayers for Buckingham in Laud's private devotions, which (strangely enough) were made a charge against him, are evidence of this.

We have divided the reign of Charles into two unequal periods, taking 1640, when the King was driven once more to summon a Parliament, as the turning year. It will be convenient to divide the longer of these two periods again into two unequal portions: *four years of struggle with three successive Parliaments,* 1625–1629; and *eleven years of despotic government* without Parliament, 1629–1640.

It has been mentioned as a failing of the four Stuart kings that reigned in England, that they *could not look the nation in the face.* The nation faced *them* steadily enough, and there never was any doubt as to either its desires or its determination. But the Stuarts could not meet this resolute

gaze; their eyes shifted and fell; and it is no wonder that their cause fell also. *Of none of them is this more true than of Charles I.* He hated the very name of Parliament. There he could treat in plain terms with his subjects. But to treat in plain terms with his subjects was the very thing he wished to avoid. When driven to summon a Parliament, he tried to prevent it from discussing unwelcome topics. And when he could not do that, he dissolved it.

In Charles I. we have a moral character of strange and pathetic interest,—a devout and virtuous man, convicted again and again of dishonesty. Not many princes could show a cleaner private life than Charles: yet in his public life his duplicity was such that it was perilous to trust any assurance that he gave. He preferred intrigue to openness, even when openness was more politic; and he seldom scrupled to break a promise, as soon as it became inconvenient to keep it. Yet he certainly had a conscience, and in many things strove to follow it. It is possible that, as regards his double-dealing, his conscience, under some strange system of casuistry, acquitted him. He may have thought that he had no more right to part with what he believed to be his prerogative, than he had to part with his soul; and that, consequently, no promise that he made to the detriment of the royal prerogative *could* be binding. But if this was his view, one marvels that he should have thought it right, not only to make promises which could not be

kept, but to try to get large sums of money for making them. His whole career as king was a series of mistakes; but *his worst mistake*—and it was repeated in a variety of forms—*was his incurable duplicity.*[1] In the sermon at the opening of the first Parliament, Laud had said that, if the State was to flourish and the Church to stand firm, "the king must trust and endear his people; the people must honour and support their king; both king and people must serve and honour God." It was excellently spoken. But the first-named condition was never fulfilled: the King did *not* "trust and endear his people."[2]

In his first four years Charles was always hoping that a new Parliament would be more complaisant than its predecessor; and he sometimes resorted to the shabby trick of *making his leading opponents sheriffs*, in order to prevent them from being elected. Coke, Philips, Seymour, and Wentworth (Strafford),

[1] In his *Essay on Simulation and Dissimulation*, Bacon says: "Dissimulation is but a faint kind of policy or wisdom; for it asketh a strong wit and a strong heart to know when to tell truth, and to do it. Therefore it is the weaker sort of politics that are the great dissemblers." Was he thinking of James and Charles?

[2] Bossuet preached the *Oraison Funèbre* on Henrietta Maria, the widow of Charles I., 16th November 1669. It contains a magnificent panegyric of her and her husband. Of the latter he has the courage to say that he was *juste, modéré, magnanime, très-instruit de ses affaires et des moyens de regner. Jamais prince ne fut plus capable de rendre la royauté, non seulement vénérable et sainte, mais encore aimable et chère à ses peuples* (*Œuvres*, tome viii. pp. 314 ff.). His text was Ps. ii. 10: "Now therefore be wise, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth." He had preached before her from the same text (vii. pp. 394 ff.).

who thus far was on the popular side, were all treated in this way. But each Parliament was just as resolute as its predecessor. To a large extent it consisted of the same men; and the new-comers were just as resolute as those whose places they filled.

It is worth noting that in the Parliaments under James and Charles *there was a large contingent of lawyers.* This was of importance in two ways, 1. Although at the present time lawyers are, on the average, not better educated than persons in other professions, it was otherwise then. In the seventeenth century, *lawyers were commonly men of superior training.* 2. The presence of so many lawyers in the House of Commons *gave a legal tone to the whole discussion* of the points of controversy between the Parliament and the Crown. The language used is legal, and the questions are looked at from the legal point of view. Somewhat later, country gentlemen come to the front: but at the outset the most weighty element in the Commons consisted of lawyers.

On the Continent heavy bets were made *whether the French marriage*, so painfully arranged by James before his death, *would ever take place.* The wagers were soon lost and won. Charles allowed neither his father's death, nor the pestilence that was raging, nor the want of preparation in the royal palaces, to delay it. Buckingham was sent to France to bring home the bride. She was married to Charles by proxy in Paris according to the

Roman rite, and at Canterbury according to the Anglican.[1] War had not yet been declared against Spain, and need not have been, although it was to strengthen the King's hands against Spain that alliance with France had been sought. But, in their foolish pique against Philip IV., Charles and Buckingham determined to go on with this hostile policy, which they knew would be not unpopular. Englishmen of that age were generally ready to attack Spain.

But if Charles was to meet Spain in war, *he must first meet his subjects in Parliament,* in order to obtain the necessary supplies: and he came to this unwelcome meeting *burdened with the consciousness of having broken a solemn promise respecting his marriage,* and of having failed calamitously to deliver the Palatinate. He had promised Parliament that, if he married a Romanist, Romanists in England should receive no indulgence; and he had married Henrietta Maria under a solemn promise to grant indulgence to Romanists in England.

That was the situation when Charles met his first Parliament, 18th June 1625; and the situation repeated itself again and again throughout the reign. *Charles was always coming before the nation*

[1] "She was the evil genius of her husband, and of the nation over whom a perverse fate had appointed him to rule. Men ruefully observed that aFrench queen never brought happiness to England" (Morley, *Oliver Cromwell*, p. 29). "She was a woman of no manner of judgment; she was bad at contrivance, and much worse in execution" (Burnet, *History of His Own Time* p. 21).

with a lie in his right hand. He might have said with the "scornful men" who ruled Jerusalem in the time of Isaiah, "we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves" (xxviii. 15).

Charles expected from the Commons a large and unconditional grant. But the Commons, though ready for war with Spain and ready to pay for the war, were *much more ready to secure the redress of grievances* at home.[1] War with Spain was a luxury: the removal of evils which destroyed their liberties was a necessity. They said that they were determined "freely and dutifully to do their utmost endeavour to *discover and reform the abuses and grievances of the realm and state.*" In particular, they required that in important matters the King "should take the advice of a *settled and constant council.*" This, of course, was aimed at the single and irregular counsellor, Buckingham; and the debate was sharpened by the news that, although the Lord Keeper Williams had promised in the King's name that the laws against Roman Catholics should be observed, yet an order for the release of six priests had been issued. Williams had refused to seal it; but the order had been made out, at the urgent request of Buckingham, in the presence of the King. *Parliament was determined to drive Buckingham from his position.* The King was

[1] On the influence of Bodin's *Republic* upon educated thought in England, see Hallam, *Introduction to the Literature of Europe*, ii. p. 51. Alford quoted Bodin in the House.

equally determined to keep him, and at once *dissolved Parliament*; 12th August 1625.

The *fondness of Charles for Buckingham* is almost as strange as that of Laud. The young King was moral, calm, modest, and precise. His favourite was dissolute, noisy, forward, and reckless. Except a fondness for art, they had few tastes in common. But they had been much thrown together, especially in the luckless expedition to Madrid. Thenceforward they lived on the terms which had been assumed as a disguise on the journey—the terms of Tom and John Smith. In short, the intimacy was one of frequent companionship rather than of community of character.

The two *tried to make themselves popular* before the next elections. They tried to *arrange a great Protestant alliance* on the Continent, and they *sent a great expedition to Cadiz*. But the Protestant alliance was never made; and the expedition to Cadiz was a complete failure.

> "There was a fleet that went to Spain;
> When it got there, it came back again."[1]

The *second Parliament* met 6th February 1626, and it determined to *impeach Buckingham*. Charles let them know that he would not allow any of his servants to be questioned by them, and that Buckingham had done nothing without the King's special direction. He reminded them that "parliaments

[1] But see the longer version of the pasquinade in D'Israeli's *Curiosities of Literature*, iii. p. 445.

were altogether in his power for their calling, sitting, and dissolution; therefore, as he found the fruits of them good or evil, they were to continue to be or not to be." In conclusion, he said, "I wish you would hasten my supply, or else it will be the worse for yourselves."

In spite of this ill-advised message, the Commons stated what sums they were prepared to grant, but with the proviso that their grievances were attended to. They then proceeded to impeach Buckingham. Charles (after hastily imprisoning members of both Houses, whom he was compelled afterwards to release) once more, in order to save Buckingham, *dissolved.* The Peers begged him to refrain. "No, not a minute," was his reply.

Charles was now left to *carry on the war with Spain* without funds. And as if this was not enough, he proceeded to *attack France as well.* A great expedition to aid the *Huguenots at Rochelle* against Louis XIII. (1627) failed disastrously, Buckingham losing more than half his forces. And there were other failures.

The cost of all this was enormous. It was suggested to Charles, that although, without a vote in Parliament, he could not make his subjects *give*, yet there was nothing to prevent him from making them *lend*,—with how little chance of repayment did not matter. So Charles *levied a forced loan*; and each taxpayer was assessed at the rate which he had had to pay in the last subsidy. Those who refused to pay were imprisoned; and when some of the im-

prisoned applied to King's Bench for a writ of *habeas corpus*, the Chief Justice, Nicolas Hyde, decided for the Crown; and the victims were left in prison. Thus *all the machinery of despotism was put in play*, including the billeting of soldiers on persons who opposed the despotism and the executing of martial law upon civilians.[1]

Unhappily for the Church of England, there were not a few of the clergy who tuned their pulpits in harmony with royal tyranny. Dr. Robert *Sibthorpe* preached at St. Sepulchre's, Northampton, 22nd February 1627, on the text, "Wherefore ye must needs be in subjection," etc. (Rom. xiii. 5). The clergy had just been asked for their opinion as to the lawfulness of the loan, and Sibthorpe gave an *emphatic affirmative*. In his sermon he said, "If princes command anything which subjects may not perform, because it is against the laws of God or of nature or impossible, yet subjects are bound to undergo the punishment without either resistance or railing; and so to *yield a passive obedience where they cannot exhibit an active one*." The phrase "passive obedience" became historical. Sibthorpe sent his sermon to the King, who wished it to be published.

[1] Clarendon gives to these tyrannical measures the euphemistic name of "Supplemental acts of State." But he condemns them unhesitatingly: "Unjust projects of all kinds, many ridiculous, many scandalous, all very grievous, were set on foot; the envy and reproach of which came to the King, the profit to other men." As a specimen of the demands made, see the letter of Bishop Juxon, when High Treasurer, to Sir Richard Wynn (Ellis, *Original Letters*, Third Series, iv. p. 213).

But this required episcopal licence; and Archbishop Abbot, who regarded the sermon as an attack on the constitution, refused to license it, although a friend of the King went to him *eighteen* times to urge this. Abbot received orders to leave London, and was struck out of the High Commission. Thereupon *Montaigne*, Bishop of London, gave his *imprimatur* to the sermon.[1]

A little later (July 1627) Dr. Roger *Manwaring* preached two sermons before the King, in which he maintained that, if the amount was not excessive, subjects were in conscience bound to pay the loan. The sermons were printed, and provoked great irritation. In opinion, *Laud* was on the same side.[2] He was not in favour of royal despotism; but he was altogether against offering resistance to a royal despot.

Meanwhile Charles was in direst need of money, and most unwillingly consented to call a *third Parliament* (17th March 1628–10th March 1629). He said that he abominated the very name. *To it came a number of gentry who had been in prison for refusal to pay the loan*; twenty-seven in all; among them, Sir Thomas Wentworth (Strafford). In this Parliament Oliver Cromwell made his first appear-

[1] See the letter of Laud (then Bishop of Bath and Wells) to Montaigne, conveying the King's wishes and hinting that the objections to the sermon have been "fully answered" (*Letter*, ccvi., April 1627). See also Laud's *Diary*, 24th April and 4th July 1627.

[2] It was he who gave leave for the printing of the two sermons, under the title of *Religion and Allegiance*; for which the Commons censured him (*Diary*, 12th June 1628).

ance. The King again greeted the House with arrogant and menacing language, which in no way turned it from its purpose. "We have come together," said Wentworth, "*firmly determined on vindicating our ancient vital liberties,* by reinforcing our ancient laws." Charles offered his royal word that he would imprison no one without just cause. *Pym* rose and said, "We have his Majesty's coronation oath to maintain the laws of England: what need we then to take his word?" Sir Edward *Coke* warned the House against accepting promises. "Was it ever known that general words were a sufficient satisfaction for general grievances? The King's answer is very gracious; but *what is the law of the realm?* that is the question. . . . Let us put up a *Petition of Right.* Not that I distrust the King, but that I cannot take his trust save in a parliamentary way." And the famous *Petition of Right* was drawn up; against forced loans, martial law being applied to civilians, billeting of soldiers on unwilling citizens, and imprisonment without assignment of cause.[1] Charles tried hard to keep the right to imprison at his discretion. In case of a conspiracy, the Crown must have unusual powers of this kind. But Parliament was much more afraid of the King's using extraordinary powers against free citizens, than of the conspirators escap-

[1] "No year within the memory of any one living had witnessed such violations of public liberty as 1627" (Hallam). "It would be difficult to name any violation of law that Charles had not committed" (*ibid.*).

ing because the King had not power enough; and it would make no concession. Charles then tried to elude the issue by declaring that "the King willeth that right be done according to the laws and customs of the land." But the Commons would have nothing but the royal assent in the usual form;—*soit droit fait come est désiré.* On the 7th of June 1628, *the Petition of Right became the law of the land*; and there was great public rejoicings.

In the history of the English Constitution *the Petition of Right is second only to Magna Carta.* And in both cases the obtaining of a solid concession from the Crown was the beginning of a revolution rather than the end of one. Each of these victories was followed by a long struggle to maintain what the victory had won. It is the struggle that turned the Petition of Right into the Bill of Rights, which lies before us. And it this struggle which makes England so different from continental States. Throughout Europe, national liberties had given place to absolute monarchies. The Stuarts supposed that the English constitution would prove equally yielding.

Triumphant at securing the King's consent to the Petition of Right, the Commons granted five subsidies; and were proceeding with *Sir John Eliot's Remonstrance,* which was a formal attack on Buckingham, when the King, to prevent it from being delivered, suddenly *prorogued* Parliament, 26th June 1628. Two months later (23rd August), *Buckingham was assassinated at Portsmouth by Felton,* a

religious and political fanatic, who gloried in the murder and made no attempt to escape. But before he died he admitted that his principles were false: he had done evil that good might come.

Charles was inexpressibly pained; but he bore the blow with fortitude.[1] Even he must have felt something of relief in the midst of his sorrow. *One grave source of dispute between the Commons and the Crown had been removed.*

But unhappily there were other grave matters of contention, which still remained unsettled. When Parliament met again for a *second session* in *January 1629*, two difficulties at once came to the front,—*tonnage and poundage* and the *religious question*. If the latter had been absent, the other would have been solved without trouble.

For 200 years it had been customary for Parliament, at the beginning of each reign, to grant the sovereign tonnage and poundage (*i.e.* the right to levy customs duties) *for life*; and about a third of the royal income came from this source. In its desire to keep strict control over Charles I., Parliament had granted this right *for one year only*. But when the year had expired, he still continued to levy these duties. He contended that the vote in

[1] Clarendon relates that the King was "at the public prayers of the Church, when Sir John Hippesley came into the room, with a troubled countenance, and without any pause in respect of the exercise they were performing, went directly to the King and whispered in his ear what had fallen out. His Majesty continued unmoved, and without the least change in his countenance, till prayers were ended." See Edmund Waller's poem.

Parliament was a matter of form. He admitted that the money was a grant from the people; but it was his *due*, by custom and necessity. This was shown by the fact that other kings had levied these duties *before* the formal grant was made. He did not wish to infringe the liberties of the people; but they ought not to wish their King to live from hand to mouth. He had gone on levying the duties without the grant for life, "assuring myself, according to your general profession, that you wanted time and not goodwill to give it me." This conciliatory message made a good impression; and if the Commons had not had their minds prejudiced by the religious question, the difficulty about tonnage and poundage would have been easily arranged. But in the Parliament of 1629 the religious question was dominant.

With us it has become almost a truism that *the House of Commons is an assembly ill fitted for the discussion of questions of theology.* But in the seventeenth century both the House and the nation thought otherwise. Elizabeth had required all her immense personal influence to keep Parliament from meddling with ecclesiastical questions. But now there was a weaker sovereign, and a much stronger Parliament. And *this stronger Parliament was unmistakably Puritan and Calvinistic.* It is vain to ask whether only a tenth, or a third, or a bare majority of the Commons, were convinced and earnest Calvinists. There may have been many who cared little either way. No doubt there

were some who were against Calvinism. But *the Calvinists had it all their own way*; and they knew that they had a large party in the country behind them. *The House of Commons then was fighting its way to supremacy.* It meant to capture the monarchy; and as a means to this end it meant to capture the Church. For this purpose there was no better instrument than Calvinistic Puritanism, to which many of them were on other grounds inclined. In short, *the House of Commons became a theological assembly,* with a religious vocation, a mission. The twenty-five years since the Hampton Court Conference had worked a mighty change. Then the Puritans had asked for toleration. Now they would grant toleration to no one else. *Calvinism was to be the unquestioned creed of the nation.* The House knew all about predestination and free grace; and no one who questioned its doctrine was to be allowed to preach. The House knew what ritual was edifying; and no minister must be allowed to use any other.

It is easy for us, with the experience of the last three centuries before us, to say that in this *the Commons made a foolish, a ruinous mistake.* They did: but it is fair to remember that *the mistake was not all on one side.* A strong revolt against the dominant Calvinism, which by means of afternoon lecturers and gentlemen's private chaplains had got its way in hundreds of parishes, had already begun, especially at the Universities. With great learning, courage, and self-control, Laud had led such a move-

ment at Oxford, where the tide had begun to turn when Sir Chris. Hatton was elected Chancellor in preference to the Earl of Essex, after Leicester's death in 1588 (see Brodrick, *Memorials of Merton College*, chap. iii.). Leicester, as Anthony Wood says, was "a great favourer of the Calvinistical party," and Essex would have been the same. Hatton was Anglo-Catholic, and when he died in 1591, the friends of Essex again failed, and Lord Buckhurst, afterwards Earl of Dorset, became Chancellor. It was during his Chancellorship that Laud came to the front. Those who were of Laud's way of thinking naturally looked to the Crown for support. *They* also asked for a great deal more than the toleration which they were not at all prepared to give. They maintained that their doctrine was the only lawful doctrine, and their ceremonies the only lawful ceremonies, in the English Church; and they wished to force their ceremonial on the whole nation. Charles proposed that both sides should keep silence about the points in dispute, as is shown in "His Majesty's Declaration," prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles, which is still retained in our Prayer Books, although it has never been sanctioned by Parliament. This was dealing equal measure to both parties; but it was impracticable. The only way to stop controversy is to produce the truth and prove that it is the truth; and even that is not always efficacious. But in other respects Charles was on the side of Laud, whom he now (1628) made Bishop of London.

Anti-Calvinists got royal favour. Parliament fined and suspended *Manwaring* for his sermons. Charles pardoned him and gave him a living, and later made him Bishop of St. David's. He made *Sibthorpe* one of his chaplains. He made *Mountague*, a strong Arminian, Bishop of Chichester;[1] and people of his school were generally welcome at court.

Then came news that *Rochelle, one of the strongest bulwarks of Protestantism*, had *surrendered to the King of France*, because England had failed to save it. A *Jesuit institution* was discovered in London, and was not made to feel the full rigour of the law. And Charles himself committed the egregious folly of having the copies of the *Petition of Right*, which had been prepared by the King's printers, with the royal assent in due form (*Droit soit fait, etc.*), suppressed. For these official copies he substituted another edition, with the evasive answer which he had wished to make, but which the Commons had refused to accept. Of course, such a fraud could not escape detection; and thenceforward he was regarded as a double-dealer. *His subjects felt that they could not trust his word, even in the highest matters of state.*[2]

[1] Laud, with the Bishops of Winchester, Ely, and Carlisle, was engaged in the consecration of M. for Chichester on St. Bartholomew's Day, when the news of the assassination of Buckingham the previous day reached him (*Diary*).

[2] Somewhat later he wrote to the Queen about his concessions respecting Ireland: "It is true that it may be that I give them leave to hope for more than I intended, but my words are only 'to *endeavour* to give them satisfaction.'"

It was not without provocation that when he became virtually a

It was in a tumult of exasperation at all this that Parliament met. Charles desired that tonnage and poundage should be taken first, and the religious questions afterwards. The Commons decided that the "business of the King of this earth should give place to the business of the King of Heaven." There was much stormy debate, and at last *the Speaker, Sir John Finch*, who had gone over to the side of the King, wished to adjourn in obedience to royal command. He left the chair; but was caught by two stalwart members, and *forced back into the chair and held there.* Then, *at the proposal of Eliot,*

prisoner in the Scottish camp at Newark in May 1646, one of the Presbyterian ministers, in preaching before him, gave out Psalm lii.:

"Why dost thou, tyrant, boast abroad
thy wicked works to praise?
Dost thou not know there is a God,
whose mercies last always?
Why doth thy mind yet still devise
such wicked wiles to warp?
Thy tongue, untrue in forging lies,
is like a razor sharp."

The King thereupon gave out Psalm lvi.:

"Have mercy, Lord, on me, I pray,
for man would me devour;
He fighteth with me day by day,
and troubleth me each hour.
My foes do daily enterprise
to swallow me outright:
To fight against me many rise,
O thou most high of might."

And the congregation were generous enough to sing the Psalm which Charles had called for.

it was declared that *anyone who introduced Popery or Arminianism* in religion, and *anyone who collected or paid tonnage and poundage, without its having been granted by Parliament*, should be reputed betrayers of the liberties of England, and enemies of the same.

This was indeed a curious combination of religious and financial grievances; but, as in the case of those who made shrines for Diana of the Ephesians, the course of events had established a real connexion between the two.

The Speaker refused to put any such declaration to the House, so it was done by Holles. The Black Rod, whose business it was to declare the House adjourned, had meanwhile been locked out. Just as the door was being broken open, the House adjourned till 10th March, the day named by the Speaker in the message from the King.

In this irregular and violent manner, hitherto unparalleled in the annals of the House, the majority gave their assent to Eliot's proposal. It was a *strange way of vindicating the dignity of Parliament, and of securing respect for constitutional forms.*

On the 10th of March, Charles came in person to the Upper House, and without sending to the Commons, "the vipers" amongst whom, he said, "should meet with their reward," he for the third time in four years *dissolved* Parliament.

This brings us to the end of the first division of this momentous reign. *Both sides were in the wrong.*

It remained to be seen which would recover itself, and which would go deeper.

1629–1640. *For eleven years Parliament never met again.* Charles avowed his intention of not summoning one. He had tried to govern with a Parliament; but Parliament itself had made this impossible. Many of his ancestors had governed for years without a Parliament: he would do the same.

But much water had flowed under the bridge since then. *Parliamentary government had rooted itself in the affections of the people*; and *Parliaments had found out their own powers.* At that time Parliament represented not merely the political but the religious opinions of the majority of the nation: and this tremendous fact Charles had failed to grasp. He was so full of the idea of handing on the royal prerogative to his successors without abridgment, that he had little room for the equally important idea of the national will. Laud, with a grand aim before him as to the ideal of the English Church, was making a similar mistake in his method of realizing it; and he and Charles supported one another.[1] Officials were to be everything, and the

[1] It was in 1630 that Laud became Chancellor of the University of Oxford, an office which he filled till 1641, and discharged with extraordinary zeal, munificence, and success. Here he was a great reformer, and found time to regulate the most minute details of University life. It was on the 19th September 1633 that Laud was translated from London to Canterbury. Twice during the previous August (4th and 17th) "a serious offer" was made to him

wishes of the governed nothing. No nation, worthy of the name, could tolerate such treatment very long.

But the bulk of the nation did not approve the violence of the Commons; and if Charles had had the mind to do it, he might quickly have put himself right with the majority of moderate and sober-minded Englishmen. But he failed hopelessly, through having no sympathy with his subjects. Every question was looked at from the point of view of the sovereign, not at all from that of the governed. He put himself technically in the right by getting courts of law to decide in his favour. But these decisions had no moral weight, because the judges were the creatures of the Crown. The Courts of High Commission and of Star Chamber were also filled with Crown nominees. Even if their decisions had always been equitable (and they were often iniquitous), they were inadequate. They could only administer the law as it was. Whereas, what was often wanted was a modification or repeal of the law.

In short, Charles was determined, both in Church and State, to govern his subjects as he thought best,

"to be a Cardinal." Each time he replied that he could not be, "till Rome was other than it is" (*Diary*). Earlier in the year he was with Charles in Scotland for his Coronation at Holyrood, 18th June; "I never saw more expressions of joy than were after it" (*Diary*). Leslie, Bishop of the Isles, told Charles at dinner that someone had said that the Scots would be like the Jews, crying "Hosanna" to-day and "Away with him" to-morrow. Charles "immediately turned thoughtful and ate no more."

instead of helping them to govern themselves in a better way than they could have done without him.

Charles's lack of sympathy with his subjects appears both in his *treatment of individuals* and in his *attitude towards the masses.* The individuals who opposed what he believed to be his authority, he fined and imprisoned, and even mutilated, without mercy. The masses he disregarded by the *exaction of ship-money* and by the *enforcement of ecclesiastical uniformity.* The latter made far more impression than the former. Not until constitutional morality has sunk deep into the hearts of a people, does the unjust treatment of individuals provoke active resistance. But the persistent ignoring of the feelings of large multitudes may do that very quickly. In the difficulties which he inherited *Charles seldom knew what was worth fighting for*, or *what it was possible to retain.* He fought obstinately for what was not worth keeping, and for what it was impossible for him to keep. Sympathy with the aspirations of many minds, which had been the strength of Elizabeth's government, would have kept Charles from this fatal error. But, in his day, *this life-giving and light-giving sympathy passed from the Government to the Opposition*; and the Opposition grew stronger and more keen-sighted day by day.

Let us look at some of the elements of which it was composed :

1. There were the *Puritans*; some of them *moderate*, and objecting only to certain ceremonies

which seemed to them to be Romish ; others *uncompromising*, and objecting to all the ceremonies of the Church, as worthless forms which debased the pure spirit of the Gospel.

2. *Moderate Churchmen of the ordinary Protestant type*, who wished things to remain as they were, and objected to the changes introduced by Laud, who in 1633 became Archbishop of Canterbury. One change, which excited great feeling, was the removal of the communion table from its common position in the centre of the church, and placing it at the east end, fenced off by rails. To multitudes this seemed like an attack on the favourite Protestant doctrine, that the individual has direct intercourse with God, without the intervention of priests or sacraments. It appeared to intimate that God must be approached only in a prescribed form, and through official personages. Laud's changes were mostly in the direction of "decency and order"; but they were enforced with a ruthlessness which drove many moderate Churchmen into Puritanism, almost in spite of themselves.

3. The *Lawyers*. Many of these were still on the side of the Crown, partly because they hoped for promotion, partly also because they regarded the royal power as, in the last resort, the basis of authority. But there were many others, men of high character and ability, who saw that, in difficult questions, there must be some basis more secure than the arbitrary will of one man. This they found in Parliament, whose decisions would be

guided by definite principles; whereas the decisions of a prince would be likely to be dictated by particular emergencies. No doubt Parliaments might become tyrannical; but, as representing the wisdom and will of the nation, they were less unsatisfactory than an absolute king. Just as in religion the Puritans looked to principles discoverable by reason, rather than to the rules of an authoritative Church; so, in government, these lawyers looked to principles discoverable by reason, rather than to the commands of an authoritative monarch.

It would be *a great mistake to suppose that the Opposition was "got up" by a number of fanatics.* An opposition, such as overthrew Charles I., cannot be "got up" at all. It was the growth of years; and it attracted to itself some of the noblest spirits in the country, and some of the most conservative. No doubt there were fanatics in it. A time of prolonged popular excitement is sure to breed fanatics. There were *political fanatics,* who thought that, because kings make grievous mistakes, all royal power must be swept away; and *religious fanatics,* who could allow no way to heaven other than the one which they themselves approved. Men of this kind swelled the ranks of the Opposition, and sometimes drove it to extremes; but they did not constitute it. It was the natural reaction from a perhaps equally natural absolutism. The reformation of Henry VIII. had been a royal reformation: it put the King in the place of the Pope. The people were now to have their reformation, putting

the national conscience (sometimes strangely misguided) in the place of both Pope and King.

We need not spend much time upon the details of the despotism carried out by Charles, with the help of Laud and Wentworth, during the eleven years of government without Parliaments. But it must not be forgotten that, in this, it was Charles who, not merely *provoked*, but *began* the revolution. For the King to govern without a Parliament is as revolutionary as for Parliament to govern without a King.

The dissolution of the Parliament in 1629 was immediately followed by the *arrest of nine members* who had led the opposition to the King. Most of them were in time released: but *Eliot*, *Holles*, and *Valentine* were heavily fined. Eliot refused to pay, and was kept in prison till he died—three and a half years later. His family asked leave to remove his body to Port Eliot. Charles wrote at the bottom of the petition, "Let Sir John Eliot be buried in the church of that parish where he died." The King's animosity against this martyr in the cause of liberty was not quenched by his death.

It was now that *Wentworth went over to the side of the King*. Possibly the violence of the Commons disgusted him. He was made a peer and President of the Council of the North. Later he was sent as Lord Deputy to Ireland. Other popular leaders, as *Digges*, *Noy*, and *Littleton*, accepted promotion from Charles, and thereby tied their hands.

We once more begin the dismal round of acts of

oppression; the flagrant violations of the *Petition of Right*, to which Charles had given the royal assent. Besides these, *monopolies* were again granted; the *forest laws* were revived; the obsolete *fines for refusing to receive knighthood* were again enforced. Royal proclamations were once more declared to have the force of laws. Fines and other iniquitous punishments were inflicted by the Council, the *High Commission Court*, and the *Star Chamber*,—three instruments of misgovernment, which were worked by almost the same body of officials. As if to accentuate the sense of exasperation at ceaseless demands for payments to which the King had no right, immense sums were raised for the *rebuilding of St. Paul's*, and great pressure was put upon wealthy persons to induce them to give. In this matter, Laud, who gave £100 a year himself, was insatiable.

But the mention of St. Paul's reminds us that there were other features in this reign besides those of regal and ecclesiastical despotism and vehement popular remonstrance. It was to St. Paul's that the preaching of *John Donne*[1] attracted multitudes, and kept them there enthralled; "carrying some," as Walton says, "to heaven in holy raptures, and enticing others, by a sacred art and courtship, to amend their lives; here picturing a vice so as to make it ugly to those who practised it, and a virtue

[1] See J. B. Lightfoot's sketch of him in *Classic Preachers of the English Church*, Murray, 1877.

so as to make it beloved even by those that loved it not." Donne was a poet as well as a preacher; and he was the friend of the mother of another preacher-poet. It is difficult to realize that the three years of *George Herbert's* quiet saintly life at Bemerton were the years that followed on the murder of Buckingham and saw the beginnings of the struggle to maintain the Petition of Right. And yet another clerical poet must be remembered, *Robert Herrick*, who for eighteen years held the living of Dean Prior in Devonshire, was turned out by Cromwell in 1647, and restored by Charles II. And then there was "the ever-memorable *John Hales*," one of the greatest scholars in Europe, whom Laud with great difficulty persuaded to accept a prebend of Windsor; a man of large views and unusual tolerance, who perhaps knew better than Laud did the difference between essentials and externals. And, as those who have read *John Inglesant* will remember, there is the convent home of the *Ferrars* at Little Gidding—one of the loveliest experiments in religious life since the Reformation.

Side by side with these were the men who, by their examples and their exhortations, were a blessing to all who saw and heard them then, and who, by the *books of devotion* which they have left behind them, have been a blessing to thousands since they passed away; *Lancelot Andrewes*, *Jeremy Taylor*, and *John Cosin*. It was to prevent the ladies of the court from using the Roman books which the

Queen gave them, that Cosin in 1627 published his *Collection of Private Devotions.* It contains prayers for the departed, and indicates the importance of sacraments, and therefore was at once denounced by the Puritans.

Two others must be mentioned among the numbers of good men who in those troubled times were mainstays of the Anglican Church; *Henry Hammond* and *William Chillingworth.*

Henry Hammond has been called "*the father of English commentators.*" He introduced a new method into the study of Holy Scripture; what has been called the *historical* method. Controversialists on all sides had claimed the sacred writers as being decisive for them; *i.e.* they settled beforehand what the meaning *must* be. Hammond set the sacred writers in their own age, and tried to ascertain what the meaning to that age was likely to be.

And *Chillingworth* may be called "*the father of Anglican comprehensiveness.*" He had been converted to Romanism by Fisher, Laud's Jesuit antagonist; but he afterwards returned to the English Church, broadened, and not embittered, by his changes. His *Religion of Protestants* (1637) is a defence of religious freedom. In it he protests against the "presumptuous imposing of the senses of men upon the general words of God, and laying them upon men's consciences, under the equal penalty of death and damnation."

It was through such men as these that *the*

Church of England, even in that disturbed age, *was keeping in touch with all sorts and conditions of men.* There were saintly people among the Puritans also, a few of whom are known to us. But although saintliness in persons of different schools of thought may be equally estimable, it is not equally influential. The saintliness of Puritanism wins our admiration, but it does not make us long to go and do likewise. It worships the Jealous God of Sinai, and it works under the eye of the Awful Judge.[1] But it knows little of the Fatherhood, and still less of the Motherhood, of the God of Love. It is a religion for the severe and the stern, perhaps also for the sad. But there are large tracts of human life which it does not touch, because it has no sympathy with them. The universe is full of beauty, which man was meant to enjoy. Society is full of God's good gifts, and they are not there simply to be abjured. There must be a religion for those who live in the world, and delight in its innocent and elevating joys. Music and the drama, poetry and painting, literature and social life,—all these things are part of the education of mankind, and we need not,—nay, we dare not, exclude them. And it is just here that the Catholic Church, precisely because it is Catholic, can do for human life in its entirety what Puritanism at its best has never been able to accomplish. And it was a noble form of Catholicism that was being

[1] "All is, if I have grace to use it so,
As ever in my great Task-master's eye."
MILTON at 23.

exhibited in the Anglican Church just before the Calvinistic deluge of the Commonwealth swept over it, and for a time obscured it.

But we must return to the turmoil caused by a sovereign smitten with political blindness and a Parliament that had lost its balance on the subject of religion.

By 1638, Charles had lost the trust and the affections of his subjects; but he had not yet exhausted their *loyalty*. They applauded the Puritan martyrs, *Prynne*, *Burton*, and *Bastwick*, who lost their ears in 1637, and the lawyers who defended *Hampden* in 1638. But sympathy with the punished may be far removed from rebellion against the punisher. *It was otherwise when Charles called upon them to become punishers themselves.*

Charles and Laud made the frantic blunder of *trying to force a new English Prayer Book on the Scottish nation.*[1] In no country in Europe had the Reformation been more distinctly national than in Scotland, and in no country had it been more uncompromising.[2] The new Prayer Book was doubly

[1] In Milton's words, Charles "obtruded upon the Scots a new Liturgy, and with his sword went about to engrave a bloody rubric on their backs" (*Eikonoklastes*, xii. 223). It is not easy to determine the form of public worship in Scotland at this time. Liturgical forms were used in the service conducted by the Reader preparatory to the Parish Minister's service, but the Minister would be tied to nothing but what was scriptural, as the Psalms and the Lord's Prayer.

[2] "They ran sae far to get frae Rome,
That they ran oot o' Christendom."

hateful to them; first because it was English, and secondly because it was less Protestant than the Anglican Book, which in itself would have been an abomination.[1] Both by riot and by formal decision of the General Assembly the command of Charles for the introduction of the Book was openly defied. *Charles had to choose between submission to the national resistance and open war.* Charles was never a coward where fighting was concerned, and in 1639 he marched with an English force to the border, for what has been called the *First Bishops' War.* Only one man was killed in it, and he by accident. *The English declined to fight in such a cause*, and Charles had to make terms (the Pacification of Berwick, 18th June 1639) and return to London.

But he secretly determined that he would have his way. He sent for Wentworth, who had been doing wonders with his "Thorough" policy in Ireland, and was now made *Earl of Strafford.* Unlike Charles, Strafford had never been afraid of Parliaments. Like Henry VIII. in England, Strafford did his despotic work in Ireland by means of a Parliament which he knew how to control: "The King," wrote Wentworth from Ireland in 1638, "is as absolute here as any prince in the world can be": and he *strongly advised Charles to summon an English Parliament now.*[2] It was rumoured that the

[1] Charles and Laud wished to enforce the Anglican Book. It was the Scottish Bishops who insisted on a different Book.

[2] See Morley's just estimate of Strafford, *Oliver Cromwell*, pp. 32–36, 85–88.

Scots were intriguing with France; and it was hoped that Englishmen, if only out of hatred to France, and anger with the Scots for intriguing with France, would rally round their sovereign once more. Moreover, the imprisonment of the Protestant Elector Palatine had made the English Puritans very irritated against France. Under the hopeful expectations which these circumstances excited, the Council succeeded in persuading the King to break the silence which had been imposed on the nation for eleven years, and to allow it once more to make its desires known in a Parliament. *This decision caused much rejoicing throughout the kingdom.* Moderate men hoped that all would now be well. More strenuous malcontents looked forward to a strong statement of grievances and a demand for reformation. The issue of the momentous decision belongs to our next period.

IV.

1640–1649.

DOWNFALL OF EPISCOPACY AND MONARCHY.

"They bawl for freedom in their senseless mood,
And still revolt when truth would set them free.
Licence they mean when they cry liberty;
For who loves that must first be wise and good.
But from that mark how far they rove we see
For all this waste of wealth and loss of blood."

MILTON.

IV.

1640–1649.

THE DOWNFALL OF EPISCOPACY AND MONARCHY.

We are at the moment when Charles, under the influence of Strafford, has *consented to summon a Parliament.* Charles, Strafford, and Laud were all of opinion that force must be used in dealing with the rebellious Scots, and that the new Parliament must be asked to supply the money. *Strafford advised applying to the Irish Parliament first.* He could secure a favourable answer there, and then the English Parliament would probably follow suit. He returned at once to Ireland, and, although suffering greatly from gout, in fourteen days he accomplished his object. On 23rd March 1640, the Irish Parliament granted four subsidies, and declared that, if necessary, they would devote their property, and even their persons, to the service of the King.

The eyes of every one in all three kingdoms were fixed on the English Parliament, which met 13th April. Would it support Charles in his sovereignty

over Scotland? or would it use the crisis to enforce its own demands? May, in his contemporary history, remarks that the news of the meeting of Parliament almost amazed the people, "so strange a thing was the name of Parliament grown." After eleven years' interval nearly all the members were new, and although determined to work for the rights of the nation, they were not fanatical malcontents. They had an old and well-trained member for a leader. In the Parliaments of James and Charles, *John Pym* had been second only to Sir John Eliot as a leader of the national party. He had suffered imprisonment for his courage in denouncing abuses. He and Wentworth had been colleagues in opposing the misgovernment of Buckingham. Now that Wentworth was in Buckingham's place, *the two firm friends had become firm opponents.* When Wentworth left the national party, Pym said to him: "You are leaving us; but I will never leave you while you have a head on your shoulders." The saying was soon to be fulfilled. Pym was no extremist either in politics or religion: he was for constitutional monarchy and for Protestant Episcopacy. Nor was he a gloomy fanatic: his enemies among the Puritans denounced him as a man of pleasure. Indeed, in him and his former friend the characteristics of the two parties seemed to have changed sides. While Pym had much of the geniality of a cavalier, Strafford had the severity, and sometimes the gloom, of a Puritan.

When the Commons met, Pym was one of the

first to rise. He had drawn up a long list of grievances under three heads: *innovations in religion, invasions of private property,* and *breaches of the privileges of Parliament.* Charles wished that subsidies should be granted first and grievances considered afterwards. But the Commons would give nothing for nothing. The King must restore the rights of the nation before they voted money to the King. Charles offered to give up ship-money, if twelve subsidies (£960,000) were granted. But the Commons refused to buy what was theirs by right. To buy would imply that hitherto ship-money had been legal. When their grievances had been considered, they would consider the King's need of funds. *Charles at once dissolved,* 5th May, after the House had sat three weeks. *This was doubly foolish.* Moderate men, who would have sympathized with him, if he had dissolved because Parliament refused to give him money to defend England from invasion, were irritated at his dissolving because the Commons would not change their order of business. Secondly, the Scots believed that, as Parliament had granted no money, Englishmen were on their side; and this encouraged them to invade. This is the *Second Bishops' War.* It was like the first. The English army would not fight, and the Scots soon had Northumberland and Durham in their hands. They refused to retire, unless they were paid their expenses at the rate of £850 a day. The English army would not attempt to drive them out. In order to set free these two counties, Charles must

have a large sum of money. And in order to get this he *must summon another Parliament.*

But before we look at what is perhaps the most famous Parliament in English history, we must consider the proceedings of another notable body,—*the Convocation of 1640.* Of course it had been sitting simultaneously with the "Short Parliament" of three weeks' duration: and it had *continued to sit after Parliament was dissolved.* It was doubtful whether this was legal. They were advised that it was legal,[1] and possibly the advice was correct; but it was unwise to attempt to legislate on important matters, when their right to do so was technically disputable. They passed a new *Book of Canons,* which are still sometimes quoted, and are of considerable historic interest, as showing (1) what was *the aim of Charles, Laud, and Strafford with regard to the monarchy,* and (2) what was *the mind of the rulers of the Church* at that time with regard to certain matters of *doctrine and ritual.*

(1) As to the first point, the aim seems to have been to establish *autocracy upon a spiritual basis.* The first canon calls monarchy the "most high and sacred order of things," and says that it "is of divine right, being the ordinance of God Himself, founded in the pure laws of human nature, and clearly established by express texts both of the Old

[1] The legal advisers of the Crown declared that "the Convocation being called by the King's writ, under the Great Seal, doth continue, until it be dissolved by writ, or commission under the Great Seal, notwithstanding the Parliament be dissolved."

and New Testaments." To bear arms "offensive or defensive, on any pretence whatever," against kings is to "resist the powers ordained of God." The second canon orders the observance of the King's accession day. Then follow canons against Papists, Socinians, Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists, and those who go to church to sermons but not to prayers.[1]

It was, however, *the sixth canon which excited the liveliest opposition.* This contains the famous "*et caetera* oath," which it required all clergy, schoolmasters, divinity graduates, licensed practitioners, register actuaries, and proctors to take. The oath runs thus:—"I, A. B., do swear that I approve the doctrine and discipline, or government, established in the Church of England, as containing all things necessary to salvation; and that I will not endeavour by myself or any other, directly or indirectly, to bring in any Popish doctrine contrary to that which is so established; nor will I ever give my consent to alter the government of this Church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, *&c.*, as it stands now established," and so forth.

(2) It is from the seventh canon, which is long and carefully worded, that we learn the mind of Laud and his colleagues on a number of points. It says that uniformity of worship is desirable as

[1] "With troops expecting him at the door,
That would hear sermons and no more."
JOHN CLEVELAND, *The Puritan.*

well as unity of faith. The position of "the communion table sideway under the east wall of every chancel or chapel is in its own nature indifferent." When this Church was reformed "from that gross superstition of Popery," all "Popish altars" were destroyed, because "of the idolatry committed in the Mass." But Elizabeth ordered that the holy tables should stand where the altar stood; and this has been the custom in royal chapels, most cathedrals, and some churches. It was fitting that this custom should be made universal, "saving always the general liberty left to the Bishop by law during the time of adminstration of the holy communion." Then follows the doctrinal statement: "And we declare that this situation of the holy table doth not imply that it is, or ought to be, esteemed a true and proper altar, wherein Christ is again really sacrificed: but it is and may be called an altar by us in that sense in which the primitive Church called it an altar, and in no other." This canon also recommends, though it does not order, that people should "do reverence" on entering and leaving church, "not" (it says) "with any intention to exhibit any religious worship to the communion table, the east, or church, or anything therein contained, in so doing, or to perform the said gesture in the celebration of the holy eucharist, upon any opinion of a corporal presence of the body of Jesus Christ on the holy table, or in mystical elements, but only for the advancement of God's majesty, and to give Him alone that honour and glory that is

due unto Him, and no otherwise." And then are added these useful words, which might be remembered of other things besides the now obsolete custom of making an act of reverence on entering or leaving church: "and in the practice of this rite, we desire that the rule of charity described by the apostle may be observed, which is that they which use this rite despise not them who use it not, and that they who use it not condemn not those that use it."

These canons show two things as regards practice and doctrine in the Church of England under Charles I.: (1) that, like the original English Reformers, the Caroline divines *appeal to the primitive Church*; (2) that, like the same, they *reject the Romish doctrine* that "Christ is again really sacrificed" in the eucharist, or that there is "a corporal presence of the body of Jesus Christ on the holy table."

Whether, if the "*et caetera* oath" had been omitted, these canons would have met with acceptance, is uncertain. Perhaps thirty years earlier they might have done so. As it was, the outcry was such that Laud had to give way, and the King ordered that the oath "should be forborne" till Convocation met again; which was not for twenty years. It is one more piece of evidence of how strangely in the dark both Laud and his colleagues were as to the strength of the opposition, that they expected to get these canons accepted, and also hoped to win in the struggle with the rebellious

Scots. Quite independently of the temper of the Scots, and of the English Parliament so hastily dissolved, and of the masses, as shown by riots in London, there was one fact of peculiar significance which might have warned Laud, Strafford, and the King. *The majority of the clergy rejected the Book of Canons.* If the clergy of the Established Church resented such doctrine about the divine right of kings, and the immutability of deans, and archdeacons, *et caetera*, what was to be expected from Dissenters? Not a few English Churchmen, and nearly all Dissenters, regarded the invading Scots as upholders of English liberties, and they rejoiced at their occupation of the two Northern counties as supplying a lever by means of which the royal position could be forced. Thus, four months after the dissolution, Charles had again to summon a Parliament. It may be mentioned by anticipation that Parliament declared the canons of 1640 null and void.

Charles met his *fifth Parliament, the famous "Long Parliament" of history* (3rd Nov. 1640), which was destined to outlive not only Strafford and Laud, but Charles himself, with no feelings of exhilaration. The lives of his advisers, and (what he seems to have cared for far more) the prerogatives of his Crown, were at its mercy.[1] Pym and

[1] In the opening words of *Eikon Basilike* we read: "This last Parliament I called, not more by others' advice and necessity of my affairs than *by my own choice and inclination, who have always thought the right way of Parliaments most safe for my crown, as best pleasing to my people.*" Of this strange statement Milton

Hampden had been indefatigable during the elections, and an overwhelming majority had been secured for the National party. *The time for reform had gone by: these men had met together for nothing less than revolution.* Clarendon tells us that, when the King dissolved the Short Parliament, it was his most bitter opponents who could not "conceal the joy of their hearts, for they knew . . . that so many unbiassed men would not be elected again."

And this is how *Clarendon describes the new House of Commons*: "There was observed a marvellous elated countenance in most of the members before they met together in the House: the same men who six months before were observed to be of very moderate tempers, and to wish that gentle remedies might be applied without opening the wound too wide and exposing it to the air, and rather to cure what was amiss than too strictly to make inquisition into the causes and origin of the malady, talked now in another dialect both of things and persons, and said that they must now be of another temper than they were the last Parliament; that they had now an opportunity to make their country happy by removing all grievances and *pulling up the causes of them by the roots*, if all men would do their duties."[1]

rightly says, that it "is to all knowing men so apparently not true, that a more unlucky and inauspicious sentence . . . hardly could have come into his mind" (*Eikonoklastes*, i. 15).

[1] "The Long Parliament was made up of the very flower of the English gentry and the educated laity." It was a "phalanx of country gentlemen, of the best blood of England, belonging to a

One very remarkable sign of the times must be noted: *the Puritan emigration to New England almost suddenly ceased.* Men had been going across the seas in search of freedom: now they believed that they could get it at home.

In short, it was generally recognized that the despotism of the King was already defeated: the question that remained was, how far the victorious party would go in placing restrictions on the vanquished.

When Parliament met, Hamilton warned the King of the fate which awaited Strafford and Laud, of whom he said that "one would be too great to fear, and the other too bold to fly." Strafford had two leading maxims of policy besides that of "Thorough." One was, that if a minister is to succeed, he must be *entirely trusted by the King.* The other was, that a trusted minister must be *prepared to lose his head.* Strafford was not entirely trusted by the King,[1] and yet he lost his head. Like most shifty men, Charles put entire trust in no one. As Laud said, Strafford had the misfortune

class of strongly conservative instincts and remarkable for their attachment to the Crown. . . . It is curious, too, how many of the leaders came from that ancient seat of learning which was so soon to become the centre of all who held for Church and King. Selden was member for the University of Oxford, and Pym, Fiennes, Marten, Vane, were all of them Oxford men" (Morley, *Cromwell*, p. 75). Of the 490 who had sat in the Short Parliament, nearly 300 were elected again for the Long one.

[1] See Browning, *Strafford*, Act I. Sc. ii.; Act II. Sc. ii. The concluding scene, in which Charles visits Strafford in the Tower, is against all historical probability.

to "serve a mild and gracious Prince, who *knew not how to be, or to be made, great*" (*History of the Troubles and Trial of Archbishop Laud*, chap. ix.). He was given to dallying with inconsistent policies and intriguing with opposite parties. He was rigorous enough to make himself hated, without being firm enough to make himself respected.

Pym took the lead in impeaching his former friend for high treason. Strafford came to the House of Lords on the morning of 11th November, apparently still the most powerful man in the kingdom. In the afternoon he was in prison. Why did he come? He must have known his danger. Charles had said that he could not do without him; and he pledged his royal word for his safety. *Probably no trial, except that of Warren Hastings, has ever excited such intense interest.*[1] The impeachment failed, for no one act of his could be shown to be high treason. Then he was struck down by a *Bill of Attainder*, which was passed by the Peers, under popular intimidation, in a small House of forty-five, by the small majority of seven. A Bill of Attainder, as Goldwin Smith remarks, is an instrument which no just man would now use against the worst criminal. But in those times it was a recognized process in jurisprudence, and would have been freely used by

[1] Robert Baillie, in his *Letters and Journals*, says: "It was daily the most glorious assembly the isle can afford; yet the gravity not such as I expected; oft great clamour without about the doors." Laud says that the Bill of Attainder "was denied by two or three and fifty, able men as any in the House of Commons."

either side. Even the gentle Falkland and the moderate Hyde voted for it. The truth was, that Strafford was too commanding a genius to be either acquitted or pardoned. His despotic policy of "Thorough," so successful in Ireland, where it was not unsuitable, was a most formidable enemy to the freedom of England, where it was intolerable.

But the Bill that was to be his death-warrant needed the King's signature; and Charles had pledged his word that not a hair of his head should perish. It scarcely makes his conduct the better that Strafford generously sent word that he released him from the pledge. On Saturday, 8th May, a deputation of Peers advised him to give his assent. Charles deferred his decision till Monday. Of the five Bishops whom he consulted, Archbishop Usher, who accompanied Strafford to the scaffold, and Juxon of London, advised him not to shed the blood of a man whom he believed to be innocent. Williams and the other two told him that he must concur with the two Houses of Parliament; that he must not ruin himself and his family; that to refuse would not be to save Strafford, but to perish with him. And the Bill was signed.[1]

Charles signed his own death-warrant when he signed that of Strafford. His signature declared that faithful execution of the King's commands was

[1] It was signed on the Sunday night. On Sunday morning the Earl of Bedford, who was "one of the main plotters of Strafford's death" (Laud), died of small-pox. But see Clarendon, *Hist. Rebell.* i. p. 422.

a capital offence; and *Strafford's death left Charles without a single man of first-rate ability on his side.* Milton calls this execution "the most reasonable and solemn piece of justice that had been done of many years"; but it was a political act of needless, and therefore criminal, severity. It would have been possible to render Strafford harmless by perpetual imprisonment such as Raleigh's. His death has thrown a halo round him, and to some he is still almost a martyr. But, as Essex said, "stone-dead hath no fellow." The man who is in his grave can never join another in a plot. When you next read the 25th Psalm, you may care to remember that Strafford said it on the scaffold.[1]

The *impeachment of Laud* followed closely on that of Strafford. Had his conduct been less free from reproach than it was, he would have had but little chance before such a Parliament. Like not a few Puritans before his own tribunals, Laud was already condemned before he entered the court. He was sent to the Tower, and was there when Strafford was executed, 12th May 1641, although the two were not allowed to meet.

Other enemies of the popular cause were pro-

[1] Strafford had married the sister of Denzil Hollis or Holles, one of the Five Members. Holles told Strafford that his life would be spared, if he would use his influence with Charles to abolish Episcopacy. Strafford replied that "he would not buy his life at so dear a rate." Strafford, like his master, died rather than sacrifice the Church of England. See Sir John Denham's poem on *Strafford's Trial and Death,* and John Cleveland's *Epitaph upon the Earl of Strafford.*

ceeded against. The five judges who had declared ship-money to be legal, were impeached, and the thirteen Bishops who had passed the canons of 1640. In one way or another the chief instruments of the King's despotism were prosecuted. But much useful legislation was passed. *Every third year there must be a Parliament*, whether the sovereign liked to summon one or not. Tonnage and poundage were regulated, and ship-money was forbidden. The *Star Chamber*, the *High Commission Court*, and *Councils of the North*, *of Wales*, and *of Lancaster* and *Cheshire*, were abolished, together with the *Forest Courts*. And to all this Charles gave his assent. He even *assented to an Act depriving him of the power to dissolve the Long Parliament without its consent*.[1] But he never knew when to be firm and when to yield with grace. He conceded a prerogative as valuable to the nation as it was to the Crown, when he allowed the Parliament to sit as long as it pleased. In the *Eikon Basilike* it is rightly called "an act unparalleled by any of my predecessors." Burnet remarks that, while the King's other great concessions saved him from immediate overthrow, this unwise concession led to his ultimate ruin.

Parliament was now the sovereign of its sovereign Charles, and continued to be so till a fragment of it put him to death; in doing which it became *the servant of its servant, the army*, and continued to

[1] Laud states that this fatal Bill was signed at the same time as the fatal Bill against Strafford.

be so, till the last flicker of it was extinguished by Oliver Cromwell.

We have now reached the crisis when the reforming or popular party was split in two. There were those who thought that the King's power had been greatly reduced, and that, if he were entirely dethroned, there was no one to put in his place. They must therefore make the best of him, and put some trust in him. There were others who saw that he still possessed an amount of power, which, in the hands of an unscrupulous sovereign, might be very harmful to the nation. He had the control of the militia, the only military force in the kingdom; and by refusing his assent to Bills he could stop all legislation. They must therefore regard him with suspicion, and jealously prevent him from getting the control of anything of importance. Falkland, Hyde, St. John, and Culpeper belonged to the one class; Pym, Hampden, and the "Root-and-Branch" men to the other. The latter believed that the last day of Parliament would be the last day of Charles's good faith. They must go on, until it was impossible for him to undo their work. Unhappily, Charles had given them good reason for believing this. But *they need all this to justify them in giving the word for revolution.*[1]

[1] "In truth, the cause of the King's ruin lay as much in his position as in his character. . . . We may say of Charles I. what was said of Louis XVI. Every day they were asking the King for the impossible—to deny his ancestors, to respect the constitution that stripped him, to love the revolution that destroyed him. How could it be?" (Morley, *Oliver Cromwell*, p. 210). As Charles

Revolution is a remedy which true statesmanship and true loyalty will avoid, until all other means of curing intolerable evils have been tried. Revolutions are full of elements which every good citizen must hate, and every good Christian deplore. Moreover, they leave a long train of evils behind them. They may evoke energy, bravery, promptitude, and other heroic virtues. But these are more than paid for by the *social depression*, and the *political bankruptcy*, and the *moral infidelity* which follow. Neither the English nor the French Revolution can lead any patriot to wish that his country should go through the like struggle again.

On the whole, this division of the reforming party on the political question corresponded with the division on *the religious question, which still remained to be settled.* Hardly anyone wished to see the ceremonial, which Laud had tried to force upon the nation, retained. Those who were inclined to give the King a further trial wished in the main for the state of things which had prevailed before Laud's innovations, *i.e.* modified Episcopacy, with a certain amount of liberty in thought and ritual. The more extreme party, who had a small majority, wished to see Puritanism established by law. The Prayer Book must be subjected to a drastic revision; and the Bishops

himself said, if their demands were granted, "we may have swords and maces carried before us, and please ourselves with the sight of a crown and sceptre; but as to true and real power, we should remain but the outside, but the picture, but the sign of a king."

must be turned out of the House of Lords and placed under very strong restrictions. But, just as hardly any of the moderates desired to keep Laud's new ritual, so hardly any of the Puritans desired entirely to abolish Episcopacy. That desire came later.

Here Charles once more had a great opportunity.[1] Had he thrown in his lot with the moderates, and acted on the defensive against revolutionary measures, he would have won much sympathy. But, *by an act of supreme folly*, he once more gave overwhelming advantage into the hands of his bitterest opponents. He listened with some patience to the Grand Remonstrance, 1st December 1641;[2] but he engaged in one intrigue after another, and *by his attempt to arrest the Five Members* on the charge of high treason, 4th January 1642, *he made reconciliation impossible.* Even moderate men then saw of what intolerable things he would be capable, if he were ever allowed to get the upper hand. Indeed, when the King, with his eighty armed followers, entered the lobby of the House of Commons, the Civil War had virtually begun. A paper with the words, "To your tents, O Israel," was flung into his carriage as he drove

[1] He was enthusiastically received in London on his return from Scotland, 25th November 1641. As Laud says, had he resolved to "leave them their ancient and just privileges," there would have been a turn in his favour. Even the massacre of the Protestants in Ireland, 23rd October 1641, would not have prevented this.

[2] See the sketch of a reply to it made by Laud (*Works*, vii. p. 631 ff.).

back from a second futile attempt to capture the Five Members. Clarendon calls the attempt "the most visible introduction to all the misery that afterwards befell the King and kingdom."

Yet, in spite of this, Charles still retained the support, and even the devotion, of not a few. There was the *conservatism that disliked change*, and *the sentiment that revered the traditional glories of the old monarchy*.[1] There was the fear, expressed by Hyde, that *a single Chamber was going to make itself despotic*. There was also the fear, expressed by Falkland, Hales, and Chillingworth, that *all freedom of thought would be stifled* by the intolerant dogmatism of the Puritan clergy. And there was the terror, felt by many, at the *amazing outburst of sectarianism* all over the country, and especially in London: Socinians, Presbyterians, Brownists, Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy Men, Levellers. In the debate about the impeachment of the thirteen Bishops who had passed the canons of 1640, Bishop Hall of Norwich said in his defence of the clergy: "The Church of England is miserably infested with Papists on the one side, and Schismatics on the other. I do perceive a great deal of zeal for the suppression of the former, and I do heartily thank God for it; but for the other, I do not find many that are sensible of the danger of it. Alas, my Lords, consider what it is that there should be in London and the suburbs no fewer

[1] "Quis est enim, quem non moveat clarissimis monumentis testata consignataque antiquitas?" (Cic. *De Div.* i. 40).

than four-score congregations of several sectaries, instructed by guides fit for them, cobblers, tailors, felt-makers, and such-like trash" (Hansard, *P.H.* ii. p. 989; Paton, *Papal Claims*, i. p. 173). In the spring of 1642 (Milton tells us) the Royalists had forgotten to complain of the Puritans in their alarm at the Brownists.

But *no one was ready with a solution of the religious difficulty.* How much freedom was to be allowed to ministers and congregations inside the Established Church?[1] How much freedom was to be allowed to those who had separated from the Church?

There were, in the main, three answers; but none of them solved the difficulty.

1. There was *the answer of the Puritans.* There can be no freedom: all must believe and worship as we do. This is tyranny pure and simple.

2. There was *the answer of the thinkers*, such as Falkland, Hales, and Chillingworth. Persecution is unlawful. Reason, rather than authority, must decide in religious questions. Men must be left free to accept what seems to them to be the truth; and worship must be simple, in order that as many as possible may be able to join in it without offence.

This is vastly superior to the Puritan answer; but it will not work. These thinkers failed to see

[1] "Everybody was in favour of Church reform, but nobody had any clear ideas of the principle on which reform should proceed" (Morley, *Cromwell*, p. 93).

that *reason pure and simple has never settled any great question of human conduct.* Even among thinking men, habit and feeling often control the intellect. And they also failed to see that to make worship very simple will not make it universally acceptable. The absence of accessories may be intolerable to some minds as the presence of them is to others. Worship may become a burden, if not a mockery, to those who find in it nothing to express or stimulate their deepest emotions. The only way to make worship generally acceptable is to present it in a great variety of types. This brings us near to the third answer.

3. *The answer of the Independents.* Government interference with religion is unlawful. Each group of men that meets together for worship must be allowed to worship in the way that suits them best. Every congregation must fix its own ritual for itself.

This is at least as valuable as the second answer; and both have contributed towards the discovery of a true religious toleration. Chillingworth and Hale wished for *considerable freedom of thought combined with complete unity of worship.* The Independents contended for *complete freedom of worship combined with considerable unity of thought.* What was wanted was that the State should leave each religious body free to manage its own religious affairs, so far as this could be done without danger to the nation; and should leave each individual free to belong to what religious body he pleased, or to

abstain from belonging to any. But the time for that had not yet come.[1] In the religious struggles of that time *it was the Independents who carried the day.* The intolerance of Laud was followed by the intolerance of the Puritans; and then the one-sided and imperfect toleration of the Independents swept away both. The experiment advocated by Hales and Chillingworth was not even tried.

If Charles alienated many by his folly, so also, after August 1641, did the Commons: and in the same way; *they assumed powers which they did not possess.*

Not even Parliament as a whole, still less the Commons alone, and least of all a bare majority in the Commons, *was competent to determine a system of doctrine and worship for the whole nation.* And the nation had never intended that it should do so. The men who constituted the Long Parliament were sent there to rescue the liberties of the nation from the despotic methods of Charles, and to put an end to the detested activity of Strafford and Laud.

[1] In the work of winning religious freedom for Christendom, "England took the lead. Yet even here the end was not attained without a struggle, carried on with unexampled perseverance and devoted self-sacrifice. A bloody civil war lasting for years, the upsetting of a throne, and the overthrow of the dynasty, had to intervene before the principle of liberty of conscience became a national conviction penetrating all civil and political life. Not until then did all parties recognise that without liberty of conscience men cannot attain to civil freedom, or maintain it for any length of time" (Döllinger, *Addresses on Historical and Literary Subjects*, p. 243).

They were *not* sent there to revolutionize the State, and still less to revolutionize the Church. It was the mingled obstinacy and weakness of Charles which led some of even the best of the Commons to go onwards to *political revolution*. But when it came to *ecclesiastical revolution*, many of those who were on the national side refused to take this step, and drew towards the King. When the majority in the Commons persisted in enforcing Puritanism, they alienated large numbers in the House, and ultimately more than half the nation. It was not as *King* that Charles found so many to fight for him; for he had proved a tyrannical ruler. It was not his *family connexions* that won him many adherents; for he was a Scot, who had married a foreigner and a Roman Catholic: and the Scots were his first opponents, while the French sent no help. It was not his *personal character* which made many devoted to him; for he was never to be relied upon, even by those who served him best: Strafford's death had proved that. It was as *the defender of the English Church and of the Book of Common Prayer* that he was so enthusiastically served. Thousands fought for him, who would never have drawn a sword if they had not believed that his authority was necessary to save the historic Church of England from extinction.

Thus *each side lost adherents through its extravagance*. And in few things was extravagance more conspicuous than in *external behaviour*. The Royalists erected jollity into a virtue; the Puritans

denounced cheerfulness as a vice. Like the Pharisees before them, the Puritans gloried in the strict morality of their side: yet in practice they cared more for the strictness than for the morality. And if there were Pharisees among the Puritans, there were Sadducees and publicans among the Royalists: men of lax morals and reckless life, with no guiding principle but a love of adventure and a hatred of puritanical gloominess.[1] Was there not as much to be dreaded as to be hoped for in the victory of either side? And was there no alternative between Calvinistic rigorism on the one hand and riotous irreligion on the other? If neither thinkers nor fanatics could find an answer to the difficult problems of the age, certainly Rupert and his dissolute troopers, with no policy beyond the cutting down of "Psalmsinging Roundheads," were not likely to help matters. On the other hand, "of the Parliament it may be said, with not greater severity than truth, that scarce two or three public acts of justice, humanity, or generosity, and very few of political wisdom or courage, are recorded of them from their quarrel with the King to their expulsion by Cromwell" (Hallam).

[1] The Royalist writer Symmon, in his *Defence of King Charles I.*, says: "Never had any good undertaking so many unworthy attendants, such horrid blasphemers and wicked wretches, as ours hath had. I quake to think, much more to speak, what mine ears have heard from some of their lips; but to discover them is not my present business." Culpeper wrote to Lord Digby: "Good men are so scandalised at the horrid impiety of our armies, that they will not believe that God can bless any cause in such hands."

The Civil War began when Charles hoisted the Royal Standard at Nottingham, 22nd August 1642.[1] We have no time to follow its course, but must confine ourselves to noting certain results. At *Edgehill*, where the first blood was drawn, Sunday, 23rd October, the battle was a victory for neither side. But *by the middle of the next summer the Parliament seemed to be near total defeat.* June and July 1643 mark the highest tide of Royalist success. The defeats of the Fairfaxes in Yorkshire, and of Waller in Devonshire, and the surrender of Bristol, had made the Royalist cause almost triumphant. Gloucester was being besieged, and if that was taken, the Parliament would have been driven to make terms. It was *this desperate condition of the forces of the Parliament* which *was the immediate cause of the downfall of Episcopacy in England.*

It is a great mistake to suppose that the majority, or even a large minority, of the men who constituted the Long Parliament came to Westminster in 1640 with *a desire to abolish Episcopacy.* It would be nearer the truth to say that *the majority had a positive dislike to Presbyterianism.* Some wished that Bishops should be turned out of the House of Lords. Probably most wished that the powers of Bishops should be considerably curtailed. But very few indeed desired that the government of the Church of England should be

[1] The 22nd fell on a Monday, as in 1904. Those who regarded omens noticed that a few days later the standard was blown down by a high wind.

transferred to a body of elders. On the 8th of February 1641, *Digby* said in the House: "If we hearken to those who would quite extirpate Episcopacy, I am confident that, instead of every Bishop we should put down in a diocese, we should erect a pope in each parish." *Falkland* said that there was now nothing to be feared from the tyranny of Bishops, and that therefore there was no need on a few days' debate to change an order which had lasted 1600 years, and with it to change the whole face of the Church.

But in the first half of 1643, as the fortunes of the Parliament went lower and lower, it became evident that, if Charles was to be vanquished, *the help of Scotland must be secured.* Negotiations went on for some time; but the Scots absolutely refused to help, *unless the English Parliament adopted the Solemn League and Covenant*; *i.e.* unless the government of the Church of England was made Presbyterian. There must be uniformity of Church government in the two kingdoms. The English Parliament would have avoided this condition, if it could; but the Scots were inexorable. And when the agreement was drawn up that *the Church of England was to be made like "the Church of Scotland* in doctrine, worship, discipline, and government," Vane proposed an amendment, which was accepted, that the words should be added, "*according to the word of God.*" The Scottish system was to be adopted *only so far* as it was agreeable to the word of God. This left a door open for subsequent modifications.

There may have been English members of Parliament who rejoiced at the downfall of Episcopacy, but *to the House as a whole it was an unwelcome necessity.*

The agreement with the Scots was Pym's last work. He died 8th December 1643, worn out with excitement and unceasing toil. Hampden had fallen the previous June: and now the one commanding figure on the side of the Parliament is *Oliver Cromwell. With his Ironsides, which were never beaten, he decided the war.* We must pass on to the decisive year, 1645.

On the 4th of January the Lords passed the *Bill of Attainder against Archbishop Laud.* He had been in the Tower since 1640, but had not been brought up for trial until March 1644. As in Strafford's case, the impeachment for high treason broke down, and he was then disposed of by Attainder; and *he was executed 10th January.* In the first instance he was condemned to be hanged; but, at his own request, he was spared that brutal indignity.

There are *few characters in English history to whom it is less easy to do justice than to William Laud.* As in the case of Elizabeth, we owe so much gratitude, and yet there is so much which it is impossible to approve. There is, however, this great difference between the two cases. It is scarcely possible to believe that Elizabeth was a religious person. None but the most prejudiced would doubt that Laud was a sincerely devout man. His own description of the way in which he was treated at his trial might almost suffice for that.

"My very pockets searched; my Diary, my very Prayer Book, taken from me, and after used against me; and that in some cases not to prove but to make a charge. Yet I am thus far glad, even for this sad accident. For by my Diary your Lordships have seen the passages of my life; and by my Prayer Book the greatest secrets between God and my soul; so that you may be sure you have me at the very bottom: yet, blessed be God, no disloyalty is found in the one, no Popery in the other." It may be added, as further evidence of sincerity, that Laud's Diary, like the Confessions of St. Augustine, is sometimes addressed to Almighty God.

It is very easy, with Macaulay, to scoff at Laud; to point to things which he unquestionably did, to quote from his Diary what he unquestionably wrote, and then to pour contempt on him for having done and written them.[1] What public man's character would stand, if every foolish and unjust thing that he ever did or uttered were remembered, while all the good which he did or attempted to do was forgotten? Let Laud be held responsible for all the mischief which he did. But if we desire to be fair to him, we must also remember, not merely the good which he accomplished, but also the good which it is quite evident that he intended and tried to do.

We have no time for details; but his grievous shortcomings may be summed up under two heads:

1. *As a Bishop, he was* (in modern phraseology) *too*

[1] Milton leads the way in this kind of criticism: see *Eikonoklastes*, i. 28.

little of a Father in God, and *too much of a father-in-law*. Fully convinced as he was that his jurisdiction was by Divine Apostolical right, yet, in exercising it, he seems to have acted almost entirely as a government official. Whether in dealing with clergy or laity, and especially in dealing with supposed offenders, the paternal relation in which he stood to them by virtue of his sacred office was forgotten, and *he acted as if all his powers were derived simply from the Crown*, and as if it was simply on the King's behalf that he was exercising his jurisdiction. This was nothing less than tragic. Throughout the land Laud was labouring to teach men the spiritual character of the Church; and all the while, by the way in which he discharged his duties as the chief representative of the Church, he led men to think that the Church had no spiritual character at all. He behaved as if the Church was a department of the State, and as if Episcopacy was a combination of powers delegated from the Crown. That a Primate who could point so firmly to the primitive Church as the standard for his own Church's doctrine and practice, should adopt methods so utterly unlike those of primitive Christianity, is as surprising as it is distressing.

2. Laud not only secularized his spiritual office by the manner in which he exercised it, *he added to it official work which was purely secular*. In the Middle Ages there was something to be said for Bishops becoming ministers of State. They were often the ablest men; they were generally the best

educated men; and they were frequently men of the best character. In the seventeenth century the ablest and most cultivated and most estimable men were by no means always, or even most frequently, Bishops: and Laud did both the Church and the nation very bad service by accepting civil duties in addition to ecclesiastical work which would have taxed any man's powers to the uttermost. The consequence was that the Church's work was often done hurriedly, or entrusted to incompetent hands, or not done at all. Moreover, over-work made Laud irritable and peremptory, less and less able to take a just view of things, or to act with discretion in critical situations. A further consequence of Laud's purely secular work was that *the Church was dragged into political troubles* and *made to appear as the supporter of the King's despotism.*

But let us turn from these necessary criticisms to the pleasanter task of pointing out some of the services which, at great personal labour and risk, Laud rendered, not merely to his own generation, but (still more) to the Church of England throughout all generations. And if we wish to know his mind about his own work, we shall perhaps find it best in his "Conference with Fisher, a Jesuit," first published in 1628, five years before he became Primate and became overwhelmed with secular and temper-trying duties. With some of his utterances there and elsewhere as our guide in estimating his actions, we may place his merits, like his demerits, under two heads:

1. Like Bishop Butler, a century or more later, *he was well aware of the importance of externals in religion.* With the Prayer Book in his hand he saw clearly what the public worship of the Church ought to be; and, when he visited parish churches, or made inquiries of other Bishops, he learned that, in a large number of instances, the minimum of decency prescribed by the Book was not even distantly approached. And he set to work, with great courage and diligence, though with far too little sympathy and consideration, to get this great evil remedied. This is his own account of the matter:—"No one thing hath made conscientious men more wavering in their minds, or more apt to be drawn aside from the sincerity of religion professed in the Church of England, than *the want of uniform and decent order in too many churches in the kingdom.* And the Romanists have been apt to say, the houses of God could not be suffered to lie so nastily as in some places they have done, were the true worship of God observed in them, or did the people think that such it were. It is true, the inward worship of the heart is the great service of God, and no service acceptable without it, but *the external worship of God in His Church is the great witness to the world* that our heart stands right in that service of God. . . . These thoughts are they, and no other, which have made me to labour so much as I have done for a decency and orderly settlement of the external worship of God in the Church" (Letter to Charles I., dedicating the "Conference with Fisher" to him, p. xvi.).

2. The other great merit of Laud is that he saw clearly what was, in some measure perceived by Elizabeth, the *immense possibilities which lay before the Church of England.* He saw the difference between an English Church and an Anglican Church, *i.e.* between a communion which was merely to satisfy the religious needs of a majority of the English nation, and a *great central spiritual power capable of becoming in the fullest and best sense Catholic.* A National Church is a fine thing: it sanctifies patriotism, and enables the people to follow after that righteousness which alone exalteth a nation. But a Church which is both National and Catholic is a far finer thing: it has a world-wide mission, capable of holding out hands of sympathy, and sometimes of fellowship, to Churches that lie on the right hand and on the left, and of offering to those who have no Church a system of truth and of discipline that cannot fail to bring a blessing to them. Laud had his grand conception of the Anglican Church, and he asked men to begin to realize it by making the externals, which expressed this noble spirit, as comely as, in such a cause, they ought to be. We are still a good way off from the realization of this ideal. But we are a great deal nearer to it than Laud was: and those of us who believe in the ideal, and think that it is worth working for and praying for, ought not, while criticizing some of Laud's methods, to forget the nobility of his aims.

If the execution of Strafford was criminal, because utterly unnecessary, *much more criminal was*

the execution of Archbishop Laud. Hallam rightly calls it "*one of the greatest reproaches of the Long Parliament,*" and a far more unjustifiable instance of "tyrannical use of power" "than any that was alleged against him." Hallam attributes it to "the remorseless and indiscriminate bigotry" which "heaped disgrace on Walton, trampled on the old age of Hales, and embittered with insult the dying moments [and funeral] of Chillingworth."

At the battle of Naseby, 14th June 1645, *Charles was finally crushed.*[1] From that time onwards the question was not as to which side would win, but how long the death-struggle could be prolonged.[2]

Yet, *for the Parliament, this victory won by Cromwell and his Independents, was full of difficulty.*

[1] A week or two beforehand, Digby had written: "Ere one month be over, we shall have a battle of all for all"; and he was right. Naseby, if not one of the "Decisive Battles of the World," was decisive of English history.

[2] "Now the King and the Crown
Are tumbling down,
And the realm doth groan with disasters;
And the Scum of the Land
Are the men that command,
And our slaves are become our masters."

ALEXANDER BROME in 1645.

Nearly all the verse-makers of the time were on the Royalist side. The poets of the National cause were George Wither, Andrew Marvell, and John Milton. See Sir Samuel Luke's account of the battle, written the following day (Ellis, *Original Letters*, third series, iv. p. 253). A week before the battle he had been very despondent about "the Parliament cause," which he thought "was never in soe declineing a condition as at present" (p. 243). It was Luke whom Cromwell commissioned to carry the treasure taken at Naseby to Northampton.

The Independent Ironsides were splendid in the field; but what was to be done with them when the fighting was over? They claimed to have fought for religious liberty, and they refused to sheath their swords till this was secured. They saw that to enforce religious liberty at the point of the sword was impossible. Military force might win this freedom; but the civil power was its proper guardian. The King and Parliament ought to undertake this duty. But *neither King nor Parliament thought religious liberty desirable.* Each wanted to enforce a special form of religion. The army of Independents offered to support Charles if he would accept their views; but he was intriguing with the Scots, and refused to listen to them. In short, the difference between the Independent army and the Presbyterian Parliament became so acute that opposition to Charles was almost the only bond which kept them still united. Parliament wanted to make all people accept the Covenant; but the Independents had not fought their way over the bodies of their fellow-countrymen simply to exchange the conformity of Laud for the conformity of the Presbyterians. *Their object was to sweep away conformity altogether*, and leave every congregation free to worship as it pleased. After Cromwell had finished the war, he for two years made London his headquarters, while the contest between the Presbyterian metropolis and the Independent army continued. It ended wholly in favour of the latter; and 7th August 1647, *the army took possession of London.*

Charles, as usual, was intriguing with two or three different parties at once,—with the Scots, with the army, and with Parliament.[1] *His negotiations with the Scots bore fruit.* In April 1648, a Scottish army, under the Duke of Hamilton, was ordered to march into England.

Cromwell's army was furious at being again obliged to risk their lives because of the King's duplicity in trying to put the kingdom in the power of the Scots, who, if victorious, would enforce Presbyterianism. The officers, in a prayer-meeting at Windsor, resolved, "that it was their duty, if ever the Lord brought them back in peace, to call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to an account for that blood he had shed and mischief he had done to his utmost against the Lord's cause and people, in these poor nations."

What is sometimes called *the Second Civil War* lasted from April to August. In August, after three days' fighting, Hamilton's army was cut to pieces and scattered to the winds. Both Charles and the Parliament were now at the angry army's mercy. During its absence, Charles, who had fled from Hampton Court to the Isle of Wight, had continued to negotiate with the Commons. *But the Commons insisted upon Presbyterianism*, and *to*

[1] From Hampton Court, where he was allowed freedom of correspondence, he wrote to the Queen: "Be quite easy as to the concessions which I may grant; when the time comes I shall very well know how to treat these rogues, and, instead of a silken garter, I will fit them with a hempen halter." The letters captured at Naseby were of a similar character.

this Charles would not consent. Nor would the army. *They* declared that those who liked Bishops might have them, and those who liked elders might have them; but no one was to be punished for preferring either to the other. One of them went so far as to say, "If I should worship the sun or moon, like the Persians, or that pewter-pot on the table, nobody has anything to do with it." But this was in advance of most, who would not allow freedom of worship to Roman Catholics.[1] Not even Milton, who otherwise taught toleration, could see his way to including Romanists.[2]

Charles had fled to the Isle of Wight for safety, but he soon found that he was really a prisoner at Carisbrook. But whose prisoner? The Parliament's or the army's? To remove all doubt on that point, the army had him taken to *Hurst Castle*, a solitary fortress on the sea-coast of Hampshire, 1st Decemder 1648; thence to *Windsor*, and thence to *London.* The Parliament wished to come to terms with him. But on the 5th of December *Cromwell* returned to London; and on the 6th and 7th *Colonel Pride administered his "purge" to the House of Commons.* Every member who had voted for making terms with the King was got rid of. Forty-seven were imprisoned; among them Wil-

[1] No English Romanist seems to have joined the Parliament against the King; but it was said at the time, that out of about five hundred gentlemen who died fighting for Charles, nearly two hundred were Roman Catholics.

[2] See *Mode of Establishing a Free Commonwealth*, §§ 14, 40; *Areopagitica*, § 77.

liam Prynne, Laud's victim, M.P. for Newport in Cornwall, and Charles Vaughan, M.P. for Honiton. Ninety-six were expelled; among them the Members for Devon, Exeter, Plymouth, and Barnstaple. Many fled. A House of about three hundred was reduced to about eighty. *This is the infamous Rump Parliament,* which continued to act as the representative of the Long Parliament, until Cromwell, at the dictation of the army (which, he said, "had made him their *drudge* upon all occasions"), put an end to its shameful existence, 20th April 1653. Just after the "Purge," *it voted that Charles Stuart should be tried for treason against the people*: seventy-eight were present, and twenty-eight of these voted against it. The vote for trying Charles was demanded by the army, which meant to have his life. In obtaining it, the army had to be content with a mere shadow of Parliamentary authority. The Upper House refused to concur. *With a fragment of the House of Commons the work of murder was done.* Of *Cromwell's share in it,* about which much has been written, we can say no more than that he certainly made no attempt to *dis*suade those who declared that the death of Charles was necessary. The army, with a small remnant of the House of Commons as its instrument, satisfied its desire for vengeance, without one word of protest from Cromwell. *That is certain.* To what *extent* he approved, and *why* to any extent he approved, are futile questions. He made no sign and left no confession. The secret went with him into the grave. What we

know is this. *A word from him might have saved Charles,* and *the word was not spoken.* The regicide assembly put Charles to death, and, of the fifty-nine who signed the warrant for his execution, ten were kinsmen of Cromwell.

Carlyle has told us that "this action of the English regicides did in effect strike a damp like death through the heart of flunkeyism universally in this world; whereof flunkeyism, cant, cloth-worship, and whatever ugly name it have, has gone incurably sick ever since, and is now at length in these generations rapidly dying."

The statement is astounding. Sentimental cant and cloth-worship have thriven on this crime and blunder ever since. Who feels any sentimental attachment to James II. or Napoleon III.? It is because Charles I. ended his days on the scaffold, rather than in the ignoble obscurity of a comfortable exile, that so many of us are apt to forget the criminal wrong-headedness and perfidy which brought him into collision with his subjects. *The true lessons to be learned from the overthrow of Charles I. are these*: that rulers must measure their powers by the needs and reasonable desires of their subjects; and that the one royal prerogative which is worth any sacrifice to keep is the *confidence and respect of the people.* In order to preserve quite worthless, and indeed obsolete and impossible prerogatives, Charles sacrificed this,—the absolutely necessary possession of a king,—over and over again. It was the first thing that he threw overboard in

his courageous but unworthy struggle to save more showy accessories.

But while we condemn his tyranny and duplicity, *we cannot forget the crimes of those who overthrew him.* The responsibility of being the first to appeal to force *perhaps* rests with him. But as soon as the appeal was made, many of those who opposed him seem to have thought that his perfidy freed them from the common obligations of honesty and honour. They inflamed the populace with misrepresentations, and even calumny. They exercised a power far more autocratic and unconstitutional than that of which they deprived the King: they punished on mere suspicion, and with a high-handed disregard of even the forms of law: they disposed at will of the persons and property of their fellow-countrymen. Such things are perhaps inseparable from revolution; they are certainly inseparable from civil war. But we feel that a strange nemesis has overtaken the revolutionists, when we see that the outrages which preceded and followed the death of Charles were committed by the men who had begun the struggle against their King with the cry for right and justice.

It was in front of the banqueting room at Whitehall, the place where English kings used to show themselves to their people after their coronation, that the bloody deed was done. When the masked executioner held up the severed head, crying "This is the head of a traitor," there rose from the vast multitude, that pressed upon the encircling

troops, a cry at once of remorse, of powerlessness, and of terror, the irrepressible utterance of outraged human nature, a voice the impression of which haunted some who heard it to their dying day.

On the scaffold Charles had said that he died *as the martyr of the people.* It is incredible that a few minutes before his death he should have uttered what he knew to be untrue. Yet it was as the martyr of an expiring form of royalty that Charles died, rather than as a martyr of the people. If ever there was prince who fought by all means secret and open for the personal exercise of his own power, that prince was Charles I. But there is a sense in which it *is* true that Charles was the martyr of the people. Faithless as he often was, he had some high convictions with which he never trifled, and against which no pressure could induce him to act. He died on the scaffold sooner than violate them. He might have saved himself in one of two ways: by sanctioning *the establishment of Presbyterianism as the religion of England,* or by allowing *the complete independence of the army.* The one meant the destruction of the English Church;[1] the other meant the destruction of political liberty. The man who was willing to lose his head, rather than sacrifice either of these to the clamours of a

[1] In October 1641, Charles sent from Scotland to his Secretary of State a pledge which proved prophetic: "I command you to assure all my servants that I am constant to the discipline and doctrine of the Church of England established by Queen Elizabeth and my father, that *I resolve by the grace of God to die in the maintenance of it.*" This was a pledge which he nobly kept.

victorious faction, may be truly called the martyr of the people. We may feel indignant when we see Charles counting the violation of royal pledges a price worth paying for the preservation of royal power, and reckoning the happiness of his subjects of less account than his own hereditary privileges; but there should be nothing but grateful admiration, when we see him valuing his own life less cheaply than those national treasures, which, by perishing himself, he has preserved for ourselves (see Ranke, *History of England*, ii. *sub fin.*).

We shall continue to dispute about the chequered life and character of Charles I. But there ought to be no dispute about the grandeur of his death.[1]

[1] Bishop Burnet says that in his day it had often been observed (and the remark has often been repeated since) that the whole race of the Stuarts "bore misfortunes better than prosperity" (*History of His Own Time*, i. p. 81). The saying is eminently true of Charles. As Andrew Marvell rightly sang of him:

"He nothing common did, or mean,
Upon that memorable scene,
But with his keener eye
The axe's edge did try;
Nor called the gods with vulgar spite
To vindicate his helpless right,
But bowed his comely head
Down, as upon a bed."

APPENDIX

In the period treated in these lectures we have had the execution of two Stuart sovereigns, Mary, Queen of Scots, and her grandson, Charles I. of England. To both of them compositions have been attributed, which are said to have been written by the royal prisoners in the time of captivity which preceded their deaths. There is extant a rhythmical Latin prayer, which Mary of Scots is stated to have composed for her own use during her imprisonment: and there seems to be no good reason for doubting that it is really hers. Certainly there is real warmth and devotion in it, touchingly expressed. The verses said to have been written by Charles at Carisbrook in 1648 are of a different character: they lack reality, and remind us too much of the frigid and self-complacent tone of the *Eikon Basilike*. Possibly, as in that more famous production, they contain some elements which come from Charles himself. But one would prefer to think that none of the verses are his: there is as little of true piety as of true poetry to be found in them. Only the first two and last three stanzas are even in form a

prayer, and they are such as few people would care to retain for their own use. In the intermediate nineteen stanzas the verse-maker gives a great deal of information to Omniscience. Mary's simple expressions, however, come home to the heart with a power wholly wanting in the laboured triplets attributed to her grandson: probably many persons have often used them. The Latin original has a charm, which cannot be reproduced in English; but for those who know no Latin an English rendering is here added.

PRAYER OF MARY QUEEN OF SCOTS IN CAPTIVITY.

O Domine Deus, speravi in Te.
O care mi Jesu, nunc libera me.
In dura catena,
in misera poena,
desidero Te.
Languendo, gemendo, genuflectendo,
adoro, imploro,
ut liberes me.

My Lord and my God, I have hopèd in Thee.
O dearest Lord Jesus, deliver Thou me.
Bound by my chain,
In sorrow and pain,
I long sore for Thee.
Sighs and groans sending,
My knees to Thee bending,
I pray and beseech Thee,
Deliver Thou me.

With the easy flow of these genuine petitions contrast the strained grandiloquence of the following address to the Almighty:—

MAJESTY IN MISERY.

An Imploration to the King of Kings.

Carisbrook, 1648.

1. Great Monarch of the world, from whose power springs
The policy and power of kings,
Record the royal woe my suffering sings;

2. And teach my tongue, that ever did confine
Its faculties in truth's seraphic line,
To track the treasons of thy foes and mine.

3. Nature and law, by thy divine decree
(The only root of righteous royalty,)
With this dim diadem invested me:

4. With it, the sacred sceptre, purple robe,
The holy unction, and the royal globe:
Yet am I levell'd with the life of Job.

5. The fiercest furies, that do daily tread
Upon my grief, my grey discrownèd head,
Are those that owe my bounty for their bread.

6. They raise a war, and christen it the cause,
Whilst sacrilegious hands have best applause,
Plunder and murder are the kingdom's laws;

7. Tyranny bears the title of taxation,
Revenge and robbery are reformation,
Oppression gains the name of sequestration.

8. My loyal subjects who in this bad season
Attend me (by the law of God and reason)
They dare impeach, and punish for high treason.

9. Next at the clergy do their furies frown,
Pious episcopacy must go down,
They will destroy the crosier and the crown.

10. Churchmen are chain'd, and schismatics are freed,
Mechanics preach, and holy fathers bleed,
The crown is crucified with the creed.

11. The Church of England doth all faction foster,
The pulpit is usurp'd by each impostor,
Ex tempore excludes the *pater noster.*

12. The presbyter and independent seed
Springs with broad blades; to make religion bleed,
Herod and Pontius Pilate are agreed.

13. The corner stones misplaced by every pavier;
With such a bloody method and behaviour,
Their ancestors did crucify our Saviour.

14. My royal consort, from whose fruitful womb
So many princes legally have come,
Is forced in pilgrimage to seek a tomb.

15. Great Britain's heir is forcèd into France,
Whilst on his father's head his foes advance:
Poor child! he weeps out his inheritance.

16. With my own power my majesty they wound,
In the King's name the King himself's uncrown'd:
So doth the dust destroy the diamond.

17. With propositions daily they enchant
My people's ears, such as do reason daunt,
And the Almighty will not let me grant.

18. They promise to erect my royal stem,
To make me great, t' advance my diadem,
If I will first fall down and worship them!

19. But for refusal they devour my thrones,
Distress my children, and destroy my bones,
I fear they'll force me to make bread of stones.

20. My life they prize at such a slender rate,
That in my absence they draw bills of hate,
To prove the King a traitor to the State.

21. Felons obtain more privilege than I,
They are allow'd to answer ere they die;
'Tis death for me to ask the reason why.

22. But, sacred Saviour, with thy words I woo
Thee to forgive, and not be bitter to
Such as thou know'st do not know what they do.

23. For since they from their Lord are so disjointed
As to contemn these edicts he appointed,
How can they prize the power of his anointed?

24. Augment my patience, nullify my hate,
Preserve my issue, and inspire my mate;
Yet, though we perish, bless this Church and State.

A comparison of these twenty-four verses with the twenty-eight chapters of the *Eikon Basilike* will show, not only that the same topics are touched upon in both, but also that to a large extent they occur in the same order. Compare the allusion to Job in verse 4 with the allusion in chapter x.; the contents of verse 9 with those of chapter xiv.; of verse 11 with those of chapter xvi.; of verse 16 with those of chapter xxii.; of verses 18 and 19 with those of chapter xxvii.; and of the last three verses with those of chapter xxviii. The conjecture seems to be reasonable that the hand which produced the *Eikon Basilike* in 1648 produced these verses also.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

1566. Visit of Elizabeth to the University of Oxford, 31st August–6th September.
1568. Mary of Scots, escaped from Lochleven Castle, became a prisoner in England.
1569. The Northern Rebellion.
1570. Excommunication and Deposition of Elizabeth pronounced by Pius v.
1571. Ridolfi's Plot.
1572. Executions of Duke of Norfolk and Earl of Northumberland. Massacre of St. Bartholomew.
1573. William Laud born, 7th October.
1575. Death of Archbishop Parker, 17th May.
1576. Arrival of seminary priests from Douai.
1577. Whitgift, Bishop of Worcester ; Piers, Bishop of Salisbury. Suspension of Archbishop Grindal.
1580. Parsons and Campian come to England.
1581. Execution of Campian, 1st December.
1583. Death of Archbishop Grindal, 6th July ; Whitgift succeeds him.
Court of High Commission reorganized.
1584. Throgmorton's Plot: extorted confession revoked on the scaffold.
1585. Dr. Parry's Plot, and execution.
1586. Babington's Plot, and execution.
1587. Execution of Mary of Scots, 8th February.
Spanish fleet at Cadiz destroyed by Drake.
1588. Martin Mar-prelate's Tracts published.
The Invincible Armada.
Death of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leceister.

1590. Death of Sir Francis Walsingham.
1592. Visit of Elizabeth to the University of Oxford, 22nd–28th September.
1593. Execution of John Penry (Mar-prelate) for libel.
1594. Execution of the Jew, Roderigo Lopez, for conspiracy.
1595. Hutton, Archbishop of York ; Matthew, Bishop of Durham.
1596. Cadiz captured by the Earl of Essex.
Bilson, Bishop of Worcester.
1597. Bancroft, Bishop of London ; Bilson, Bishop of Winchester.
1598. Death of Lord Burghley, 4th August.
Death of Philip II. of Spain, 13th September.
1601. Execution of the Earl of Essex, 25th February.
Parliament protested against monopolies.
1602. Proclamation against Jesuits and Romish priests.
1603. Death of Elizabeth, 24th March.
Union of the two kingdoms under James I.
Plot against James I. ; imprisonment of Raleigh.
1604. Hampton Court Conference, 14th–18th January.
Death of Archbishop Whitgift, 29th February ; Bancroft succeeds him.
1605. Gunpowder Plot, November.
1606. Execution of Faux, 30th January ; of Garnet, 3rd May.
1610. Death of Archbishop Bancroft, 2nd November ; Abbot succeeds him.
1611. Authorised Version published.
Laud elected President of St. John's College, Oxford, 10th May.
Baronets created, 22nd May.
1613. Murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, 13th September.
1615. Disgrace of the Earl of Somerset.
1616 Death of Shakespeare, 23rd April.
Dismissal of Sir Edward Coke.
1617. Visit of James I. to Scotland, Laud attending him.
1618. *Book of Sports* published, 24th May.
Execution of Sir W. Raleigh, 29th October.
1620. The Pilgrim Fathers.
1621. Impeachment of Mompesson and Mitchell.
Impeachment of Lord Chancellor Bacon.
Laud, Bishop of St. David's, 18th November.
Protestation of privileges by the Commons, 18th December.

1622. Conference between Laud and Fisher, the Jesuit, 24th May.
Laud "became C. to my Lord of Buckingham," 15th June.
1623. Prince Charles and Buckingham start for Spain, 17th February; return, 5th October.
Legat burned at Smithfield, Wrightman at Norwich, for heresy.
1624. Laud's "Conference with Fisher the Jesuit, printed, came forth," 16th April.
Impeachment of Lord Treasurer Cranfield (Middlesex), 13th May.
Act against monopolies.
1625. Death of James I., 27th March.
1626. Impeachment of Buckingham.
Laud, Bishop of Bath and Wells.
Death of Bishop Andrewes, 25th September.
1627. Enforced loan; arbitrary imprisonment; martial law; etc.
1628. Petition of Right.
Laud, Bishop of London.
Assassination of Buckingham, 23rd August.
Mountague, Bishop of Chichester, 24th August.
1629. Eliot, Holles, and Valentine imprisoned.
1630. Laud elected Chancellor of Oxford, 12th April.
Leighton (*Sion's Plea against Prelacy*) mutilated and imprisoned.
1633. Prynne (*Histriomastix*) and Bastwick (*Elenchus Papismi*) mutilated and imprisoned.
Charles I. crowned at Holyrood, 18th June.
Death of Archbishop Abbot, 4th August; Laud succeeds him.
1634. First writ of ship-money issued, 20th October.
1635. Controversy about altars.
1636. Bishop Juxon made Lord Treasurer.
1637. Hampden prosecuted for refusing ship-money.
Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton mutilated and imprisoned for life.
1638. Lilburne whipped and imprisoned; Hampden condemned.
1639. First Bishops' War and Pacification of Berwick.
1640. The Short Parliament.
The Canons and the *Et caetera* Oath.
The Long Parliament.

1640. Imprisonment of Dean Cosin.
Impeachment of Strafford; sent to the Tower, 25th November.
Root and Branch Petition presented, 11th December.
1641. Execution of Strafford, 12th May.
Impeachments of Laud, Finch, and others.
Massacre of Protestants in Ireland, 23rd October.
Grand Remonstrance.
Twelve bishops sent to the Tower, 30th December.
1642. Attempted arrest of Pym, Hampden, Holles, Haslerig, and Strode, 4th January.
Bishops expelled from the House of Lords, 14th February.
Royal standard raised at Nottingham, 22nd August.
1643. Solemn League and Covenant imposed on England and Wales, 25th September.
Deaths of Hampden, Falkland, and Pym.
1644. Trial of Archbishop Laud, March–October.
Parliament ordered Christmas Day to be kept as a fast.
1645. Execution of Laud, 10th January.
Prayer Book forbidden and Directory imposed, 17th April.
Use of Prayer Book in private homes forbidden, 23rd August.
Decisive Battle of Naseby, 14th June.
1647. The King a prisoner.
1648. Second Civil War.
Pride's Purge, 6th and 7th December.
1649. Impeachment of the King before a Committee of the Rump Parliament, 20th January.
Execution of the King, 30th January.

INDEX

Abbot, Archbishop, 99.
Addled Parliament, 63.
Allegiance, Oath of, 60.
Allen, William, 12, 15.
Altars, moved by Laud, 112. 130.
Andrewes, Bishop, 116.
Anglican Church and English Church, 155.
Anglicanism, 56.
Armada, 25, 26.
Army supreme in London, 157, 160.
Arrest of the Five Members, 141.
Articles, Lambeth, 31.
Assassination, sanctioned, 15.
Assassinations attempted and effected, 15, 16.
Association, Voluntary Bond of, 20.
Attainder, Bills of, 67, 135, 150.
Authorised Version, 58, 74.

Babington, Antony, 24.
Bacon, Francis, 27, 38, 43, 51, 52, 53, 63, 67, 68.
Essays, 2, 92.
Praise of the Queen, 25.
Baillie, Robert, 135.
Ballard, John, 24.
Bancroft, Bishop, 37, 54, 74, 75.
Baronets instituted, 62.
Basilikon Doron, 55.
Bedford, Earl of, 136.
Benevolences, 63.
Berwick, 46.
Berwick, Pacification of, 120.
Bilson, Bishop, 61.
Bishops, Elizabethan, 33.
Bishops and Divine Right, 48, 78.
Bishops' War, First, 120; Second, 127.
Bodin's *Republic*, 95.
Bolingbroke, 87.
Book of Common Prayer, 4, 29. 120, 146.
Books of devotion, 117.
Bossuet, 92.
Brome, Alexander, 156.
Browning, 134.
Buchanan, 58.
Buckingham, Duke of, 62, 65, 87.
contrasted with Laud, 89.
assassination, 101.
Bull, *Regnans in excelsis*, 10.
Burghley, Lord, 11, 36, 43.
Burnet, Bishop, 64, 82, 94, 138, 164.

Cadiz expedition to, 96.
Calvin, 9, 30.
Calvinism, 29, 33.
in the House, 103, 104.
Camden, 13.
Campian (Campion), the Jesuit, 13.

Canons of 1604, 59, 74; of, 1640, 128, 131.
Cardinal's hat offered to Laud, 109, 110.
Carey, Sir Robert, 45.
Carlton, Sir Dudley, 70.
Carlyle, 161.
Caroline divines, 48, 78, 116, 131.
Carr, Robert (Somerset), 61.
Cartwright, the Puritan, 30.
Casaubon, Isaac, 56.
Cecil, Robert (Salisbury), 47, 49, 61.
Cecil, William, 12.
Charles I.—
  accomplishments, 86.
  blindness, 119, 161.
  courage, 120.
  duplicity, 91, 94, 106, 158.
  fortitude, 102, 164.
  friendship with Buckingham, 96.
  at Newark, 107.
  at Carisbrook, 159, 167.
  execution, 160, 162.
  "the martyr of the people," 163.
Chillingworth, William, 117, 142, 143.
Church, Dean, 12, 38.
Civil War, 141, 148.
Clarendon, Earl of (Hyde), 98, 102, 133, 136.
Clergy, English, 33, 59, 79, 98, 116, 132.
Cleveland, John, 129, 137.
Coke, Edward, 66, 67, 68, 69, 92, 100.
Commission, Court of High, 19, 110, 115, 138.
Commons, House of, tyrannical, 145, 156, 162.
Conformity, 14, 70, 75, 76, 157.
Convocation of 1640, 128.
Cosin, John, 116.
Counter-Reformation, 5.
Cranfield, Lord Treasurer, 72.
Cromwell, Oliver, 99, 139, 150.
  the "drudge" of the army, 160.
Crown, prerogatives of the, 45, 66, 69, 86, 91, 100, 161, 164.

Delaroche, Paul, 39.
Denham, Sir John, 137.
Digby, Lord, 147, 149, 156.
Divine Right, 48, 59, 77, 79.
Döllinger, 145.
Döllinger and Reusch, 15.
Donne, John, 115.
Douai, English College at, 12, 14.

Earle's *Micro-cosmographie*, 76.
Ecclesiastical Polity, 32, 38.
Eikon Basilike, 132, 138, 165, 169.
Eikonoklastes, 133, 151.
Elector Palatine, 65, 70, 121.
Eliot, Sir John, 63, 107, 114.
Elizabeth, Queen, 5, 10, 14, 24.
  contrasted with Mary of Scots, 21.
  with James I., 51, 77, 81.
  caprice, 43, 44.
  courage, 16, 25.
  despotism, 20, 35.
  dislike of Puritanism, 29, 34.
  popularity, 35, 39, 77.
  robbery of the Church, 33, 36, 73.
  tolerant policy, 17, 29, 34.
  death, 39.
Elizabeth, daughter of James I., 65.
Elizabethan Bishops, 33.
England and religious freedom, 145.
Episcopacy, 54, 141, 148.
Essex, Earl of, 47, 61, 137.
Et caetera Oath, 129.

Falkland, Viscount, 136, 139, 142, 149.

Ferrars, The, 116.
Finch, Sir John, 107.
Five Members, arrest of the, 141.
Forced loan, 97, 99.
France, irreligion in, 7.

Gardiner, S. R., 58.
Genevan Version, 74.
Gondomar, 49, 62, 70.
Grand Remonstrance, 141.
Green, J. R., 31.
Gregory XIII., 12.
Grindal, Archbishop, 35.
Gunpowder Plot, 60.

Habeas Corpus, 98.
Hales, John, 116, 142, 143.
Hall, Bishop, 142.
Hallam, 31, 95, 100, 147, 156.
Hammond, Henry, 117.
Hampden, John, 119, 133, 139, 150.
Hampton Court Conference, 31, 52.
Hatton, Sir Christopher, 23, 105.
Häusser, 50, 69.
Heton, Bishop, 37.
Henrietta Maria, 72, 92, 94.
Henry, Prince of Wales, 49, 61.
"Henry the Ninth," 61.
Herbert, George, 116.
Herrick, Robert, 116.
Heywood, Jasper, 13.
High Commission Court, 19, 110, 115, 138.
Holles (Hollis), Denzil, 114, 137.
Hooker, Richard, 32, 37, 78.
Howell, James, 71.
Humphrey, Dr. Laurence, 34.
Hyde, Edward (Clarendon), 98, 102, 133, 136.

Impeachments, 67, 72, 96, 135, 137.
Indecency of James I.'s Court, 66, 79, 85.
Independents, 144, 157.
Inquisition, 6.
Invincible Armada, 25, 26.
Irish Parliament, 125.

James I., 45, 50.
  Anglicanism, 55, 73.
  appearance, 51.
  character, 79.
  learning, 57, 80.
  death, 73, 88.
Jesuits, 6–9, 15, 20, 30, 76.
Jewel, Bishop, 4, 37.
Jonson, Ben, 84.
Journals of the House of Commons, 69.
Judges, English, 66, 68, 110.
Juxon, Bishop, 98.

Knighthood, 52, 115.

Lambeth Articles, 31.
Laud, William, 87, 92, 99, 105, 112, 135, 141.
  appearance, 89.
  Diary, 88, 99, 151.
  friendship with Buckingham, 89.
  mistakes, 109, 112, 119, 152, 153.
  services to the Church, 153, 154
  execution, 150, 156.
Lawyers opposed to Charles I., 112.
Lawyers in Parliament, 93.
Leicester, Earl of, 22, 33, 105.
Leslie, Bishop, 110.
Lingard, 57, 89.
Little Gidding, 116.
Loan, forced, 97, 99.
Long Parliament, 133.
Lopez, Rodrigo, 39.
London dominated by the army, 157, 160.
Lords, House of, 69, 97, 135, 160.
Loyola, Ignatius, 9, 13.
Luke, Sir Samuel, 156.

Manwaring, Roger, 99, 106.
Marsden, 28.
"Martyr of the people," 163.
Marvell, Andrew, 156, 164.
Mary I. of England, 19.
Mary of Scots, 5, 23, 25, 166.
  contrasted with Elizabeth, 21.
  prayer in captivity, 166.
  execution, 24.
Massacre of St. Bartholomew, 11.
Mayflower, the, 59.
Micro-cosmographie, 76.
Mildmay, Sir Walter, 18.
Millenary Petition, 52, 59.
Milton, 118, 119, 124, 137, 143, 151, 159.
Moderate Churchmen, 29.
Monopolies, 39, 45, 68, 115.
Montaigne (Mountain), Bishop, 99.
Montesquieu, 42.
Morley, John, 48, 94, 120, 134, 139, 143.
Mountague, Bishop, 106.

Napoleon I., 62.
Naseby, decisive battle of, 156.
Newark, Charles I. at, 107.
Northern rebellion, 10, 11, 17, 23.
Nottingham, royal standard at, 148.

Oath, *et caetera*, 129.
Oath of Allegiance, 60.
Opposition to Charles I., 111, 113.
Overbury, Sir Thomas, 62.
Oxford, Elizabeth at, 13, 34, 44.

Pacification of Berwick, 120.
Paoli, 62.
Papal aggressiveness, 17, 18.
Parliaments of Elizabeth, 17, 20, 39.
  James I., 61, 63, 67, 72.
  Charles I., 94, 96, 99, 125, 132.
Parsons (Persons), the Jesuit, 13, 38.
Passive obedience, 79, 98.
Persecution, 19.
Petition, Millenary, 52, 59.
Petition of Right, 100, 106.
Philip II. of Spain, 5, 25.
Philip IV. of Spain, 71, 94.
Piers, Bishop, 26.
Pilgrim Fathers, 59.
Pius V., 6, 12.
Plot, Babington's, 24.
  Gunpowder, 60.
  Lopez's, 39.
  Parry's, 16.
  Ridolfi's, 11.
  Throgmorton's, 15.
Polemical literature, 14, 32.
Prayer Book, Anglican, 4, 29, 120, 146.
Prayer Book for Scotland, 119.
Presbyterian Orders, 55.
Presbyterianism unwelcome in England, 53, 148.
Pride's Purge, 159.
Primitive Christianity, appeal to, 34, 56, 131.
Prophesyings, 35.
Protestation of privileges, 69.
Prynne, William, 88, 119.
Puritan objections, 53, 75.
Puritanism, constructive, 28.
  destructive, 27, 28, 30.
  limitations of, 118, 147.
Puritan's, intolerance of the, 27, 104, 140, 143.
  lawlessness of the, 131.
Purveyance, 51.
Pym, John, 63, 69, 126, 132, 139, 150.

Raleigh, Sir Walter, 47, 49, 52, 64, 65.
Ranke, 60, 71.
Recusants, 14.
Reformation, necessity of the, 3.
  results of the, 4, 113.
Regnans in excelsis, 10.

Religion of Protestants, 117.
Remonstrance, Grand, 141.
Reusch, 15.
Revolution, 114, 140.
Reynold's, Dr. John, 53, 74.
Ridolfi, 11.
Rochelle, English failure at, 97, 106.
Romanists in England, 10, 13, 15, 17, 48, 159.
Royal prerogative, 45, 66, 69, 86, 91, 100, 161, 164.
Royal proclamations, 61.
Rump Parliament, 160.

St. Bartholomew's Day, 11.
St Paul's Cathedral, 115.
Sanders, the Jesuit, 14.
Scott, Sir Walter, 43, 81.
Scottish Covenant, 149.
Second Bishops' War, 127.
Second Civil War, 158.
Sectarianism, 142.
Seminaries, 13.
Ship-money, 127, 138.
"Shopkeepers, a nation of," 62.
Short Parliament, 125.
Sibthorpe, Robert, 98.
Solemn League and Covenant, 149.
Somerset, Earl of, 61.
Somerville, John, 15.
Southwell, Lady, 39.
Spain, English enmity to, 63, 70, 95.
Spanish ambassadors, 32, 49, 62.
Spanish marriage projects, 64, 70.
Spenser's *Faery Queene*, 10, 22.
Shepherd's Calendar, 35.
Spoliation of benefices, 33, 36, 73.
Star Chamber, 67, 110, 115, 138.
Strafford, Earl of, 63, 92, 99, 100, 120, 134, 137.
Stuarts, shiftiness of the, 48, 73, 86, 90.
Stuarts, "unfortunate," 47, 49.
Supremacy, question of, 59, 104.
Symmon, 147.

Taylor, Jeremy, 116.
Throgmorton, Francis, 15.
Toleration, unknown, 76, 159.
imperfect views of, 144.
Tonnage and poundage, 102, 103.
Treasonable literature, 14.

Ultra-Reformation, 26.
Uniformity, 34, 36, 111, 144.
Union of England and Scotland, 46, 47.
Urban VIII., 11.
Usher, Archbishop, 136.

Vane, 149.
Version, the Authorised, 58, 74.
Villiers, George (Buckingham), 62, 65, 87, 101.
Voluntary Bond of Association, 20.

Waller, Edmund, 102.
Waller, Sir William, 148.
Walsingham, 18, 23, 43.
Wentworth, Thomas (Strafford), 63, 92, 99, 100, 120.
change of sides, 114.
policy, 120, 134, 136.
execution, 137.
Whitgift, Archbishop, 31, 36.
Whittingham, Dean, 31.
William the Silent, 16.
Williams, Lord Keeper, 95.
Women proselytizers, 32.
Wood, Anthony, 105.
Wordsworth, 10.

Printed by
MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED
Edinburgh

DATE DUE

MAY 20 '78

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

63349 283.048Q P736

Plummer A.

English Ch. History

Tempest

63349 283.048Q P736

Plummer

AUTHOR

Englsh Ch. Hist

TITLE

63349 283.048Q P736